

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 308

24

LI 000 266

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY EXECUTIVE--AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF
AN EMERGING PROFESSION.

BY- CARPENTER, RAY L.

NORTH CAROLINA UNIV., CHAPEL HILL

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8336

PUB DATE DEC 67

OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONTRACT OEC-2-6-068336-1462

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.04 99P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LIBRARIANS, *PUBLIC LIBRARIES, *ADMINISTRATION,
*ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, BOARD
ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, PROFESSIONAL SERVICES,
INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE, CITY
GOVERNMENT, COMMUNITY RELATIONS, GROUP NORMS, GOVERNING
BOARDS, TRUSTEES, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP,

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE CHIEF LIBRARIAN IN THE
MEDIUM-SIZED PUBLIC LIBRARY WITH GROUPS AND AGENCIES EXTERNAL
TO THE LIBRARY ARE DESCRIBED AND ANALYZED. HIS PROFESSIONAL,
TRUSTEE, AND GOVERNMENTAL EXPECTATIONS ARE DERIVED FROM THE
LITERATURE BY AND ABOUT LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS AND FROM
INTERVIEWS WITH PUBLIC LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS. COMMUNITY
APATHY, THE LOW STATUS OF THE LIBRARY, AND LEGAL AND
FINANCIAL RESTRICTIONS INHIBIT THE ADMINISTRATOR'S BEING AN
AGGRESSIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADER IN ACCORD WITH HIS PROFESSIONAL
EXPECTATIONS. PROFESSIONAL NORMS ARE OF MINIMAL HELP TO
HIM--THEY ARE WEAK, TOO NUMEROUS, AND OFTEN NON-EXISTENT FOR
DIFFICULT SITUATIONS. LOCAL PRESSURES ARE STRONGER THAN
PROFESSIONAL, ALTHOUGH PROFESSIONAL TIES AND LOYALTY ARE
CONSIDERED MOST DESIRABLE. ADMINISTRATOR-TRUSTEE
RELATIONSHIPS ARE NOT CLEARLY DEFINED AND ARE STRESSFUL.
ALTHOUGH THE ADMINISTRATOR CANNOT BE AS CREATIVE AS THE
LITERATURE OF THE PROFESSION INFERS, HE CAN INITIATE PROGRAMS
AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS TO FACILITATE THEM, LARGELY
THROUGH BARGAINING WITH BOARD MEMBERS AND GOVERNMENT
OFFICIALS. INTERPERSONAL TASKS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN
TECHNICAL ONES, AND MOST ARE WITH LAY PERSONS OUTSIDE THE
LIBRARY STAFF. THE PROFESSION HAS YET TO EVOLVE USEFUL NORMS
THAT WILL REDUCE THE STRESSES OF THE EXECUTIVE ROLE AND
ENHANCE GOAL ATTAINMENT. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE USED FOR THE
STUDY IS APPENDED. (AUTHOR)

ED017308

BR-6-8336

P.R.-24
LI 000 266

ERIC/CLIS

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 6-8336 - 24
Contract No. OEC-2-6-068336-1462

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY EXECUTIVE:
AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF AN EMERGING PROFESSION

December, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

LI 000 266

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8336
Contract No. OEC-2-6-068336-1462

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY EXECUTIVE:
AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF AN EMERGING PROFESSION

Ray L. Carpenter

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

December, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
SUMMARY	1
I. PURPOSE AND PLAN OF THE STUDY	2
Introduction	
Conceptual Orientation of the Study	
Method	
II. THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE. .	10
Introduction	
The Public Library Today	
The Public Library and Governmental Structure	
III. NORMS AND NORM CONFLICT FOR LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS	23
The Library and Librarianship as a Social Organization for Librarians	
System of Norms for the Library Administrator	
The Library Executive's Relations with his Board and Government	
Summary	
IV. THE PUBLIC LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR: INTERVIEW REPORTS	50
Introduction	
The Modal Public Library Executive	
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	79
APPENDIX	91

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to the candid and generous public library administrators who consented to interviews and responded far beyond the expectations of courtesy.

To Rupert B. Vance and Richard L. Simpson go my thanks for intellectual counsel.

The accommodation and encouragement of Deans Margaret Kalp, Carlyle Frarey, and Lucille Henderson made the work easier.

Patricia Anderson Carpenter's personal and professional assistance and editorial judgment were invaluable.

SUMMARY

The relationships of the chief librarian in the medium-sized public library with groups and agencies external to the library are described and analyzed. What the profession, the board of trustees, and government officials expect of the administrator is derived from the literature by and about library administrators and from interviews with public library administrators and other library officials.

Community apathy, the low status of the library, legal and financial restrictions inhibit the administrator's being an aggressive educational leader in accord with his professional expectations. Professional norms are demanding and often non-existent for difficult situations. Pressures from local groups are stronger than those of the profession, although ties with the profession are maintained and professional loyalty is considered most desirable.

Interrelationships of the administrator and the trustees are not clearly defined, and tension between the two is common. Although the administrator cannot be as creative as the literature of the profession infers, he can initiate programs and the interpersonal relationships that facilitate their instrumentation. Administrators may bargain with board members and government officials to achieve their ends.

Interpersonal tasks are more important than technical tasks, and most of the important social relationships are with lay persons outside the library staff. The profession has yet to evolve useful norms that will reduce the stresses of the executive role and enhance the library's goal attainment.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND PLAN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study is concerned with an occupational role that is centuries old but nevertheless is presently in the process of defining standards and functions for both its incumbents and its clientele. The study proposes to describe and analyze the role of the public library executive in his relationships with groups and agencies external to the library.

Of special sociological interest in this instance is the behavior of a professional within a bureaucracy. The common and differential values expressed by an affiliated profession and bureaucracy are of central importance in understanding the overall configuration of American society and modern societies in general.¹ The public library is a relevant and amenable subject for sociological study. It is a discernible, formally organized, and chartered social agency, and its professional executives are readily identifiable.

While the public library is itself bureaucratic in nature, its relationships with the larger bureaucracy of the city or county government are not clearly "bureaucratic". That is, the hierarchy of authority within the local government is inconsistently and often indirectly related to the public library. The board of trustees acts as a mediator and often as an independent source of primary authority over the library. Nonetheless, the public library administrator, acting in this general framework or system of bureaucracies, faces certain standards or norms delineated by his profession and a different set of specific behavioral expectations arising from his interaction with governing officials with whom he must work in order to maintain and develop the goals of his organization. The major sources of stress in this executive's role seem to arise from the differential values and expectations of his profession and the governmental bureaucracy.

The task of this study is as follows:

1. To describe the development and formal structural

features of librarianship, presenting a case-study of the public library and its chief administrator as a professional in a bureaucratic structure.

2. To identify the norms and attitudes of a panel of public library executives in order to determine their role and the various means by which the differential expectations of the profession and the local government are resolved through negotiation and bargaining by the administrator.

The results of the investigation should enlighten us further about the general problems of structured role strain peculiar to the special occupations we call professions in their behavior as part of a bureaucracy as well as clarifying the particular problems for the library administrator within this setting. Such information may assist to the end of providing more effective library administration and better education for administration.

Conceptual Orientation of the Study

The basic unit of this study is the role of the library executive. While there is considerable variation among authorities about the nature and definition of roles, Caplow has described a common core of three elements: roles are associated with organizational positions, they have "something to do with the tension between expected and observed behavior," and they are involved in interaction.² The role of the library executive is one position with a particular set of expectations and attitudes in the library organization. For librarians there are shared expectations derived from the profession and others derived from the larger bureaucracy of the community government with whose members they interact. The position of the library executive includes, then, sub-sets of expectations for and attitudes about the single position he occupies. To the extent that these expectations have sanctions they can be considered norms in that they are behavioral directives. Attitudes, however, may simply reflect ideal or rationalized behavior and may have little effect on interaction. Of further interest is the consensus among librarians concerning their norms or expectations.

More specifically, the role of the library executive may be viewed as consisting of three major parts: (1) managing the internal operations of his organization, (2) promoting of the organization, pushing for the attainment of established as well as new goals, and (3) educating -- disseminating ideas and information in accordance with the basic ideals and norms of his occupation and organization. While considerable attention has been given to the library administrative role as a manager of internal affairs of

the library, little attention has been given to his role in relation to the outside world. The focus of this study is on the latter two parts of his role, as promoter and as educator, for these most clearly bring him into contact with other organizations and have had far less consideration than the problems of internal management.

Role stress refers to the felt or perceived conflict of expectations within a role. It is assumed that the incumbent of a position tends to sustain tension when the norms of one group of which he is a member are not consistent with those of another group, and that "there tends to be a strain toward consistency or adjustment" between the various sets of norms.³ Chester Barnard's classic Functions of the Executive notes that this conflict of codes of behavior is characteristic of executives. The results of such conflict may be of three kinds:
(1) "A kind of paralysis of action - indecisiveness. . .
(2) conformance to one code and violation of another. . .
(3) a substitute action (which) satisfies immediate desire. . . or the dictates of one code and yet conforms to all other codes."⁴ The latter alternative requires a creative solution, pursuing a course of action that in some measure attains the goals of the organization and does not unduly violate the norms of conflicting interests, in this instance, the profession and the governing authority.

It is important to note that these concepts are used primarily in their structural sense. Roles, role stress, and expectations or norms as used in this analysis are viewed in terms of what the incumbents say they do or should do, both in the literature and in the interviews. The analysis is one then of "ideal" rather than of actual, observed behavior. Further it is necessary to note that we are not assuming that any incumbent's actions are simply or wholly "determined" by the various norms peculiar to his position and his roles. Two facts in the relationship between norms and roles are especially relevant to this point. The first concerns sanctions. "A sanction. . . is a punishment or reward whose aim is to procure conformity with the standards of behavior regarded as desirable by a social group."⁵ Some sanctions are clear and direct while others are diffuse or unspecified -- indeed, there are norms for which there seem to be no sanctions other than a vague, general "disapproval." Second, there may be a considerable variability of consensus on the importance of a given value.⁶ Individuals may perceive narrow ranges of behavior as being permissible, and these ranges may constitute different segments of a continuum. Or, individuals may perceive wide permissible ranges of behavior although there is quite strict consensus on the end points of the range. The range of permissible action is extremely important in analyzing conflicting social

norms.⁷ Any assumptions that the behavior of an individual is "caused" in the naive sense by norms, or that norm conflict is similarly a necessary result when two or more codes impinge on the same position are unrealistic. Rather than being points or narrow bands, norms consist of ranges of possible behavior. Indeed, the "very existence of flexibility or social slippage - but not too much - makes behavior in groups possible."⁸

The two major distinctive sources of standards for behavior for the library administrator are his profession and the local governmental bureaucracy to which he is responsible as an employee.

There is a considerable body of literature debating the issue as to whether or not librarianship is truly a profession. Many of the terms of the debate are beyond the scope of this study, but many of the conditions or characteristics of professions as they are generally denoted are relevant. Librarians talk about themselves as professionals as distinct from persons working in libraries in sub-professional or non-professional and clerical capacities; they are concerned with the problems of vocational education and with a wide range of standards for their work and its organization. Librarianship is in the process of being professionalized. Because we are concerned with what librarians say they do and should do, the element of professionalism must be considered.

These are the general characteristics attributed to professionals: systematic theory, authority, community sanction, ethical codes, and a culture.⁹ As Greenwood has put it, the possession of these attributes is "a matter of degree"; non-professionals also have these attributes but to a lesser degree. Certainly librarians would rank lower in the extent to which these traits are truly characteristic of their occupation than would some of the "traditional" professions commonly used as comparative models, such as medicine and law. Whether or not librarians have a body of systematic theory is a very relative matter. Goode suggests that this is a problem that categorically precludes librarianship's being a "true" profession.¹⁰ However, if one assumes, as do librarians, that their knowledge includes their total education of a minimum of five years of academic study beyond high school, terminating in what is universally identified as a professional degree, we see that members of this occupation are certainly highly educated specialists in comparison with the population in general. Only about eight per cent of persons in the United States twenty-five years of age and older have completed five or more years of college.¹¹ The graduate librarian with his now standard fifth-year degree thus has some claim to

having professional standing in his community. Most states do not have certification requirements for public librarians. The problem, however, goes beyond formal credentials such as these. In the community sanction of librarians as professionals, in their authority and in their ethical codes, librarians do not enjoy the kind of status they feel they should be accorded. They consequently lack the power and the status to affect the behavior of themselves and others, to the extent that they feel they should. In various ways the implications of these factors will receive attention in later parts of this paper.

Administrative demands on professionals increasingly divert them from their "real" work.¹² If this is true, it means that the public library administrator is in some respects removed or isolated from his profession, a profession that is presumably quite weak in its sanctions and degree of social acceptance. If so, what are the consequences for the administrator in terms of role conflict? Does his position as an administrator compel him to affiliate himself primarily with the local bureaucracy in instances that the profession might be expected to assume primacy? (Sayre and others have noted that professionals tend to identify more with their profession than with the bureaucracy with which they work).¹³ In what terms does he see himself accepted by the local governmental bureaucracy? Does he, in Barnard's terms, evolve creative solutions, the necessary compromises that will insure growth as well as the continuation of both the organization and his own participation in it? These are among the general questions that will be explored in this study.

Method

Relevant literature in librarianship and in other disciplines, notably sociology, social psychology, and political science, has been explored in order to provide for this study both an orientation to the general field of librarianship and the structure and norms of public library administration. Most of the ideas and information accumulated in this fashion were either quite specialized or extremely general: no previous systematic treatment of this topic or anything closely related to it exists in the literature. Most related treatises are concerned either with particular professions in general or with administrative roles and problems that are structured quite differently from that of the public library administrator.

There is a great deal of material concerned with principles, procedures and standards for library administrators, but special reliance has been placed on the textbook of Joseph Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, Practical Administration of Public Libraries.¹⁴ It is held in great esteem and distributed widely among librarians. Also very helpful was the January 1959 issue of the journal, Library Trends, which was devoted entirely to library administration. Library journal literature generally is rich in articles on this issue, many of them authored by competent critics from the social sciences as well as by highly thoughtful and experienced administrators. All points of view have been drawn on and cited to provide as thorough and balanced a description as possible. However, many writers seem quite unaware of conflicting principles and expectations that appear in their work. In fact, it seemed that many of these conflicts, perceived or not, constitute potential or actual serious problems in library administration as well as a disparity between what was being written about administration and what was being practiced.

In order to inquire more thoroughly and specifically about the problem under study, interviews were conducted with nine public library chief executives and two other library officials whose work and experience qualified them to assist in the project, all in North Carolina. The panel is not intended to be a representative sample for the purpose of quantitative analysis, but rather a means for determining expectations, attitudes, relationships, and sources of conflict with a view to presenting an "ideal-type".

The members of the panel were all experienced and established administrators of medium-sized public libraries, each serving populations of 50,000 or more, with annual budgets over \$50,000, and collections in excess of 50,000 volumes. There are no truly large libraries characteristic of the great metropolitan areas represented in this study. Smaller libraries were excluded on the assumption that they put far fewer and less complex demands on the administrator, and would not provide a source for the kind of information sought in this study.

Interview appointments were readily arranged by telephone; all interviewees accepted the request warmly. The interviews were conducted in the offices of the administrators in order to provide as familiar and comfortable a setting as possible. The interviewees were assured of anonymity when the appointments were made and at the time of the interview. The interviews lasted about three hours on the average. Some especially responsive members of the panel pursued various topics related to the interview

schedule at lunch with the interviewer. The interviews were conducted in a friendly and conversational fashion, and interruptions were minimal and in no way disruptive in spite of the duration of the sessions. The fact that the study was supported by the U. S. Office of Education apparently enhanced acceptance of the interview.

The questions were in the main open-ended and frequently accompanied with probes designed to encourage exploration of new or promising lines of discussion. The questions are grouped into several categories: (1) selected personal background characteristics, (2) attitudes towards and relationships with the profession, (3) attitudes towards and relationships with boards and city officials, with special attention to interaction actually or potentially involving conflict and tension, and (4) resolution of conflicts.

The responses to the interviews were classified and analyzed to compose a description of the "ideal-typical" public library administrator. These data with the materials from the literature constitute the basis for the representation of the role and status of the public library administrator in this dissertation.

References

1. Robert C. Stone, "The Sociology of Bureaucracy and the Professions," in Contemporary Sociology, ed. by Joseph S. Roucek (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958), p. 493.
2. Theodore Caplow, Principles of Organization (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1964), pp. 76-77.
3. Frederick L. Bates, "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," Social Forces, XXXIV, no. 4 (May, 1956), 234.
4. Chester Barnard, Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 264.
5. Julius Gould and William Kolb, A Dictionary of the Social Sciences (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), p. 616.
6. Samuel Stouffer, Social Research to Test Ideas (New York: The Free Press, 1962), p. 41.

7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p. 52.
9. Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," in Man, Work, and Society, ed. by Sigmund Nosow and William H. Form (New York: Basic Books, 1962), p. 206.
10. William J. Goode, "Librarian: From Occupation to Profession?," Library Quarterly, XXXI, no. 4 (October, 1961), 308.
11. U. S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population: 1960, Vol. I, Characteristics of the Population, pt. 1, United States Summary, p. 404, table 173.
12. Kenneth S. Lynn, ed., The Professions in America (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), p. xii.
13. W. S. Sayre, "Recruitment and Training of Bureaucrats in the United States," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCXCII (March, 1954), 39-40.
14. Joseph L. Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, Practical Administration of Public Libraries (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

CHAPTER II

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Introduction

This chapter is based on extensive gleaning of the literature dealing with the basic nature of the public library and of librarians and their place in the social structure. Authors cited include prominent public librarians and social scientists. Some of it is impressionistic, commentary based on the personal experience and observation of administrators. Other sources are quite fully documented, being based on extensive evaluations of libraries as well as practical administrative experiences; the work of Wheeler and Goldhor is a prime example. Still others reflect the results of even more systematic survey research, such as the reports of Garceau, Kroll, and Naegele. Equally important, many of the writers are essentially prescriptive while others are primarily interested in disinterested analysis and description.

The Public Library Today

Among librarians and students of library affairs the educational character of libraries is still its most important feature. Librarians have turned their attention to selecting, acquiring, and organizing ever greater numbers of books and related materials from the enormous quantity of publications. They have devised new systems and techniques for servicing these materials to effect improved educational services. And they have worked diligently to promote a new and dynamic character for the library. The phrase, "fountains, not reservoirs,"¹ has become a rallying cry, a credo to identify the library as an active organization, alert to contemporary needs, and to shed the restrictive, custodial image that has predominated. The words of Dewey, now nearly a century old, are still appropriate, for such exhortations are still relevant to the status of the library.

The time has come when a librarian may, without assumption, speak of his occupation as a profession. . . . He must see that his library contains,

as far as possible, the best books on the best subjects, regarding carefully the want of his special community. Then, having the best books, he must create among his people, his pupils, a desire to read those books.

The time was when a library was very like a museum, and a librarian was a mouser in musty books. . . . The time is when a library is a school, and the librarian is in the highest sense a teacher. . . . Will any man deny to the high calling of such a librarianship the title of profession?²

The political scientist, Morton Kroll, writes that his mid-twentieth century survey of libraries in the Pacific Northwest produced an image "of ill-supported, under-nourished, unappreciated, and understaffed public libraries, struggling, not always successfully, to provide minimal services."³ Such conditions prevail throughout the nation in spite of the ambitions and exertions of library leaders for nearly a century. A distinguished librarian and researcher, having surveyed the libraries of North Carolina, among many other states, reports that thousands of public libraries in the United States are "still at the one-room schoolhouse stage in their development - at least two generations behind modern concepts of librarianship."⁴

While by and large the public library has developed most fully in large cities, the impact of urbanization on libraries has been mixed. Many former distinctions between the highly urban and small town or small city areas are disappearing due to the development of the mass media and of modern transportation, but there is little evidence that the intellectual elements of urban culture are reaching into less densely populated areas. There is little historical basis predisposing large segments of the population to intellectual pursuits, and television, radio and newspapers have small serious intellectual or educational influence.⁵ The South with its scattered population and relative lack of wealth has been slow to produce public libraries. The county as an administrative unit is important in much of the South, and the population of many counties is often too small to insure adequate development of educational facilities. Both public schools and public libraries have tended to form on the basis of county units. Further, as Downs has pointed out in his survey of North Carolina libraries, "the natural inclination to identify education with the formal school system sometimes leads to the neglect of this, one of our most basic institutions, serving an independent educational function."⁶ The dual problem, of inadequate support and of allying schools and libraries,

usually to their mutual disadvantage, is not peculiar to any one region or size of community. As Kroll has put it, while most people profess to "like books", they feel a greater need to build roads, utilities and schools before they build libraries; they feel that "children come first", see schools as the only real source of satisfaction for the needs of the children, and have little desire or money for libraries. In even the larger cities, he reports, the rapid rate of growth has required so much intellectual effort for the solution of material problems that there is little energy and talent left over for organizations such as libraries.⁷

This implies, of course, that there is some societal ranking of organizations and that the public library ranks lower than most others. Talcott Parsons claims that the reason is not so much that American society is necessarily hostile to intellectualism and learning (including libraries), but simply that it values other things more.⁸ Further, the library, being associated with things intellectual, is vulnerable to the restrictions Americans place on intellectual behavior and organizations. The main keynote is ambivalence, not hostility, due to two main strands in American attitudes. First, we value pragmatism highly, contrasting "practical" men with theorists and dreamers. Second, the "populist" tradition of egalitarianism in part conceives intellectualism as being anti-democratic and as being synonymous with snobbery.

While there is no recent and thorough study of public attitudes towards libraries and librarians, two limited surveys do provide some information.^{9, 10} Both indicate that the context of the library-client relationship is ambiguous and that public impressions of librarians are negative. Many feel that librarians are "bookish" and learned, that they are therefore "forbidding people." Given that most librarians are women and that "culture is for them" (women),¹¹ another derogatory element is added. Librarians, quite correctly, feel that the public not only holds them in low esteem but also that it does not understand them. The misunderstanding consists of public failure to distinguish between professional and non-professional work, and of an incompleteness of the image -- the public doesn't know what the librarian does; by and large it sees only what goes on at the circulation desk. Consequently there is little general appreciation of the technical competence required for library work, for the training and education involved. Librarians are generally perceived as helpful and cooperative, in spite of being "inhibited, slightly neurotic, and conservative in their personal and social relations."¹² While most of the negative impressions of librarians are not true,

according to Naegele, they are important for their consequences. Public images ". . . are part of the stuff from which self-conceptions are made. . . . Librarians, like anyone else think of themselves in some relation. . . to the images they believe others hold of them."¹³ In brief, the library tends to be a "quiet" institution, due in part to the public attitude towards libraries and librarians, the librarians' reactions to their subjective impressions of public expectations, and to the predominance of women and the code of impartiality in the profession.

In addition to this basic ambivalence of the public attitude toward libraries, there is the added problem of defining appropriate library goals and the means of achieving them.¹⁴ The public library purportedly gives service to all members of the community. In reality it does not and cannot provide such services with its existing resources and level of community interest. The Public Library Inquiry, a nationwide survey completed in the late 1940's, describes the clientele of the public library as a quite limited group.¹⁵ Of all books read in the United States only about one-fourth were from public libraries. Only about ten percent of the adult population borrows a book once a month or more from public libraries; about eighteen percent of the adult population borrows once a year. Further, of these adult users, ten percent account for one-third of public library circulation, five percent account for two-fifths, and twenty percent account for nearly three-quarters of the books charged out. Only a minority of the adult users can be said to use the library intensively. Children and young students, on the other hand, use the library in larger proportion to their total numbers in the population than do the adults. The estimates indicate that about one-third of the pre-adult population uses the library in contrast with one-tenth of the adults -- when we define use as the borrowing of a book once a month or more often.

However, as the general report of the inquiry pointed out, "In no sense does this mean that the library patrons are an inconsequential minority nor that public library service is an unimportant segment of the whole machinery of public communication."¹⁶ Public library adult users as a group have had more schooling, have larger home libraries, and "consume" more of the mass media, newspapers, magazines, radio, and television, than the population at large. Further, library users constitute a major proportion of those who act as opinion and culture leaders in their communities.¹⁷ Consequently, the public library serves as an informational and educational agency for a highly important leadership group and further serves the interests of the community indirectly through its services to these leaders. As a result of these and related

findings, many library leaders have come to perceive the goals of their organizations in somewhat more sophisticated terms than the general goal of "service to all".

It would seem, then, that the public library's natural role as an agency of public communication is to serve the group of adults whose interest, will, and ability lead them to seek personal enrichment and enlightenment. The enlargement of this natural public library audience may well be the library's concern in cooperation with other agencies of education. But if our analysis is correct, the process of enlargement is slow, requiring intensive efforts and not producing numerically spectacular results. Meantime, adequate services to the existing and potential group of natural library users have a social value much greater than the gross numbers involved.¹⁸

While no survey so systematic or broad in scope has been carried out in the past twenty years, several sources of pressure have arisen that require further reconsideration of this statement. Librarians themselves, while recognizing the value and validity of the "natural library public", remained concerned with a felt obligation to reach a far wider public. Forces outside the profession played an even more important part. The tremendous increases in the numbers of people with higher education in turn increased greatly the "natural" library audience, and libraries were and are more often than not equipped inadequately with collections and personnel to meet the higher standards of required service. Also the various federal, state and local programs designed to improve the lot of citizens with inadequate income and poor education suggested the possibility of more broadly gauged library programs. In the past the educational role of the library was quite effective in helping to improve literacy, especially in helping immigrants to acquire a modicum of learning in order that they could attain legal citizenship. Libraries were also dramatically instrumental in assisting energetic and capable individuals to acquire knowledge that enabled them to move upward in American society at a time when entrance into special occupations was frequently relatively simple. As the need for these services diminished the library tended to turn its attention to service for the better-educated library public, to recreational reading and to special reference services.

Within the past generation, however, the boundaries of effective literacy have become quite different. Increasingly greater emphasis on formal education has in many instances prescribed the library's earlier role.

The problem today is that there are still large numbers of people who in no way participate directly either in the production or consumption of the higher technological levels of mid-twentieth century living. They are unable to use the extremely complex and demanding "bodies of print in which the knowledge and procedures of society are recorded and by which they are conveyed."¹⁹ The plight of these "excluded" from participation in and comprehension of the advanced society and its political actualities requires something more than working with individuals as illiterates. These non-participants are today often ethnically distinct, for instance, and it is suggested by some commentators that the library should work with them as a group towards the end of transforming the whole class.^{20, 21} To adopt such a role the library would be re-assuming something like its former role in "educating" immigrants, but in the process it may need to adopt policies counter to its present emphasis on serving the highly literate.

The conflict in defining appropriate library clientele constitutes a much debated problem. According to Philip Ennis it was all very well for libraries to dedicate themselves to education and uplift for everyone in the community, that such a role was part of a strong American tradition in its public institutions -- "to counteract special privilege and. . . counteract the family transmission of that privilege" -- e.g. give a special boost to those that need it most.²² However, he continues, this is not the same thing as the goal of universal service, of getting everyone to read good books and develop his capacities. In fact, this belief in universal service has contributed greatly to the failure to assign priorities to its goals. Limited resources require some ranking of goals, but librarians fail to do this and to allocate their energies accordingly. On the other hand, they do "tend to retreat from high-level goal statements into administrative objectives of efficiency!"²³ Libraries, it is claimed, should turn to a major objective such as service to the business community or to the culturally deprived, fulfill this objective and thereby acquire greater community support, then move on to another target. Otherwise, the library tends to drift with fluctuating public interest.

Indeed, it is the picture of drift that seems to be characteristic of many public libraries. A significant part of the reason for this drift stems from two major "frustrating circumstances of 'subordination' and 'isolation'".²⁴ In analyzing the librarian's anomie, Parsons has pointed out that librarians are vulnerable to the stresses of an anxious and changing society as custodians of books; they are associated with intellectuals

and can't avoid connection with sensitive areas of society such as morals, religions, and politics, without enduring pressures to severely restrict their collections. Librarianship is an auxiliary profession in that the materials it handles are the products of other occupations. Further, the demand for library materials is often incurred by educators and other professionals, rather than by librarians. Expectations of the librarian's behavior held by writers and educators are unclear and their relationships are weak. This is partly the result of the very rapid growth of libraries and of printed matter, of problems in organizing materials, and partly the result of the difficulty in defining areas of responsibility and spheres of competence and, therefore, standards of qualifications for the profession. The very diversity of library conditions makes clear-cut definitions of the profession problematic. Libraries are "subordinate", then, in that they either in the library system itself or in the general public scheme of authority "tend to have little autonomy and range for independent exercise of judgment."²⁵ The library is "isolated" in the sense that it is unique in the community, with few if any allies. The medium-sized community will likely have only a handful of public librarians, who have little occasion for frequent interpersonal contact with others in the profession, and who tend to become primarily concerned with short-run technical problems. This may explain in part why the literature of the profession is largely about techniques and gadgets, not fundamentals and basic concepts.²⁶ Naegele also noticed that in his interviews librarians were sensitive about this isolation and that they felt that there should be more opportunities for communication, largely through workshops at professional meetings.²⁷

The problematic nature of goal definition for public libraries is further complicated by the prevalence of the "demand" concept, the notion that the library should provide what the community wants. More specifically, librarians entertain two distinctive but related concepts: the supplier-oriented goals (those of the library profession) and the user-oriented or demand goals ("give the public what it wants"). As Herbert Gans has noted, librarians usually "preach" the former set of goals in their literature and generally practice the latter. Given a small clientele and the need to obtain lay, public (governmental) approval of the budget, libraries must be user-oriented.²⁸

To summarize, the several functions of public libraries so far noted tend to be so structured as to create conflicting normative conditions or, in Parsons' terms, "the fact of anomie" for libraries.²⁹ Libraries are vulnerable scapegoats for public expressions of anxiety

or hostility about books dealing with politics, morals and religion. Libraries are not clearly defined in terms of their proper "sphere of autonomy" vis-a-vis governmental authority, they are quite isolated from one another and lack any strong political allies, and they are uncertain about compromising professional determination of library collections and services in deciding about the extent to which they should go in following the doctrine that "the customer is always right".³⁰ Of these structural features, the problem of the unclearly delineated "sphere of autonomy" is particularly important for this study. The chief librarian, as the agent primarily responsible for the goal attainment and management of his organization, must contend with this ambiguity.

The Public Library and Governmental Structure

Not the least important factor in the governmental structure affecting the library is its legal status. The library is defined legally in each state, and of course the variations are considerable. Often, and most important for the study at hand, the public library is considered in law to be a non-essential public service. This is interpreted in at least the case of North Carolina as meaning that general tax funds of a community cannot be used for libraries at will by the municipal or county government. Rather, only that portion of the local tax may be expended that is specifically approved for public libraries by public vote in each community. The statute in North Carolina allows a rate up to \$.15 per \$1000.00 of tax valuation to be assessed by any county or city -- when and if such a tax is voted for by the residents of the community. This means that tax support is possible, but that it must be obtained by a special effort on the part of library supporters, and that only the amount specifically approved by the voters may be so allotted for library expenditures. The fundamental matter of providing any funds at all for libraries is still a significant problem for many communities. The problem may become further complicated when eligibility for federal financial aid requires some level of matching local funds. The Report of the Governor's Commission on Library Resources (North Carolina) has taken pains to point to the need for new legislation to both clarify and make easier the tax support of libraries.³¹

The statutes of that state further require that the governing authority of libraries be placed in the hands of a board of six trustees to be appointed by the county or city government. The powers and duties of this board are further spelled out as follows:

1. To adopt rules and regulations it deems necessary for the government of the library.

2. To acquire or erect buildings, to supervise and care for them.

3. To appoint a chief librarian and on his recommendations to appoint and remove other members of the library staff. Chief librarians must also be certified by the North Carolina Library Certification Board.

4. To fix the salary of the chief librarian and with his advice the salaries of the staff and rules for staff conduct.

5. To prepare the annual budget for the library for submission to the governing body of the county or municipality.

6. To extend use of the library to non-residents under conditions it feels appropriate.³²

The state library association has formally outlined its feelings about the role of the trustees as follows:

The Board of Trustees will serve as the liaison between the library and the public and between the library and government officials. The members will advise the chief librarian of needs of the community and will explain the library and its services in lay terms to the public. The Board will work directly with the chief librarians in adopting the budget and will assume responsibility for securing funds to meet the budget.³³

In general accordance with the law, this association also states that the trustees should be the governing agents, should determine the objectives, plans and policies concerning all library operations, and should be "able effectively to interpret the policies and financial needs of the library to citizens and governmental officials."³⁴ The underlining by this writer serves to point out that while the law requires, the state association recommends. Concerning administration of libraries, the association defines this as "professional. . . planning, organizing, and coordinating work of the various divisions and branches of the library system. Interpreting the library's program and needs to the government, trustees, and the public."³⁵

These two documents are generally compatible with one another, but from the vantage point of the administrator they serve to point up the basis of a very real and constant problem -- is the librarian or the board primarily responsible for "interpreting the library" directly to the public and to the government? The general impression is that the board's role, in accordance with the association's suggested policies, is very clearly dominant. It is the board that determines the needs of the community

and adopts the budget for these needs. The librarian's role seems to be that of a technical adviser to the board in these respects.

In the nineteenth century boards of trustees were appointed widely to afford the library a measure of protection from the deprivations of local politics. However, in the process of developing new techniques for managing the collections and services, and addressing itself to different parts of its clientele, the library began to move into areas of work and ideas that were alien to the lay trustee. Further, the very size of the library, often employing hundreds of staff members, tended to discourage the trustees' taking a very personal part in the administration of the library as had been their wont in past years. The relations between the board and the librarian have been for some time undergoing a fundamental change. Leadership of the library has in many ways come more clearly into the hands of the librarian, and librarians have been acquiring more power as an occupational group by virtue of informal association and the development of state and national professional associations. Nonetheless, the library has remained relatively isolated in each community; it is essentially a "local institution created by local loyalty to fill a local need."³⁶

It is quite apparent to many observers that much of the library's present difficulty lies in its governmental system -- in the board system of authority, to be specific. Librarians have grown in the breadth of their interests and have come to see themselves and their libraries as multi-faceted agencies of information and education, largely because of recent technological and social changes. Many board members remain essentially "local" and traditional in their orientation. As the unit of final authority, the board serves to remove the library from direct contact with the central government of the city or county. While the board acts as a buffer between the library and local government and perhaps as a champion of the library, many public officials are very ignorant of the role of the library in the community, and this buffer does not help to bring the library and city officials closer together. Indeed, it emphasizes the distance.

In the past fifty years major changes in local government have taken place, notably in the city manager system and the civil service system. The development of more "rational", educated, disinterested, and less corrupt municipal and city governments has provoked many to inquire about the desirability or the need of boards of trustees. The more-or-less professional governments of today are likely to be more receptive and understanding about public services than are lay trustees, it is asserted. Does the

board any longer need to serve as a defender of the library in the political arena? Does it tend to interfere with a more effective library by providing a barrier between the executive librarian and the city manager, budget officer and other city officials, thus preventing interaction that could benefit the library? What norms and procedures are at the disposal of the library executives for operating within this governmental structure? These and related questions are explored in the following two chapters, first by examination of the codes of norms in the literature of the profession and second by the analysis of the panel interviews with library administrators.

References

1. Arthur Hudson Parsons, Fountains, not Reservoirs: The Public Library (Chicago: American Library Association, 1958).
2. Melvil Dewey, "The Profession," American Library Journal, I, no. 1 (September 20, 1876), 5-6.
3. Morton Kroll, "Public Library Boards of Trustees," in Pacific Northwest Library Association Library Development Project Reports, Vol. I: The Public Libraries of the Pacific Northwest, ed. by Morton Kroll (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), p. 411.
4. Robert B. Downs, ed., Resources of North Carolina Libraries (Raleigh, North Carolina: The Governor's Commission on Library Resources, 1965), p. 40.
5. Kroll, op. cit., p. 412.
6. Downs, op. cit., p. 39.
7. Kroll, op. cit., p. 413.
8. Talcott Parsons, "Implications of the Study," in The Climate of Book Selection, ed. by J. Periam Danton (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1959), p. 86.
9. William H. Form, "Popular Images of Librarians," Library Journal, LXXI, no. 2 (June 15, 1946), 851-855.

10. Kaspar D. Naegele and Elaine Culley Stolar, "The Librarian of the Northwest," in Pacific Northwest Library Association Library Development Project Reports, Vol. IV: Libraries and Librarians of the Pacific Northwest, ed. by Morton Kroll (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), pp. 51-137.
11. Naegele, op. cit., p. 86.
12. Form, op. cit., 853.
13. Naegele, op. cit., p. 99.
14. Jerome Cushman, "Reflections of a Library Administrator," in The Public Library and the City, ed. by Ralph W. Conant (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), pp. 129-140.
15. Robert D. Leigh, The Public Library in the United States. (The General Report of the Public Library Inquiry) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), pp. 31-33.
16. Leigh, op. cit., p. 33.
17. Ibid., pp. 48-50.
18. Ibid., p. 48.
19. Dan Lacy, "The Dissemination of Print," in The Public Library and the City, ed. by Ralph W. Conant (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), p. 127.
20. Ibid., p. 128.
21. Philip H. Ennis, "The Library Consumer," in The Public Library and the City, ed. by Ralph W. Conant (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), p. 16.
22. Ibid., pp. 29-30.
23. Ibid., p. 31.
24. Parsons, T., op. cit., p. 94.
25. Ibid.,
26. Robert L. Collison, "On Being a Librarian," UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, XII (July, 1958), 154.

27. Naegele, op. cit., p. 112.
28. Herbert J. Gans, "The Public Library in Perspective," in The Public Library and the City, ed. by Ralph W. Conant (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965), p. 67.
29. Parsons, T., op. cit., p. 95.
30. Ibid.
31. Downs, op. cit., pp. 4, 67.
32. Alex Ladenson, ed., American Library Laws (3rd ed.; Chicago: American Library Association, 1964), pp. 1059-1060.
33. North Carolina Library Association, Public Libraries Section, Development Committee, Standards for North Carolina Public Libraries (Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State Library, 1963), p. 13.
34. Ibid., p. 4.
35. Ibid., p. 10.
36. Oliver Garceau, The Public Library in the Political Process. (A Report of the Public Library Inquiry) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 51.

CHAPTER III

NORMS AND NORM CONFLICT FOR LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS

To this point we have seen that there are three general foci of structured strain in public librarianship: the mixture of apathy, hostility, and pride in the public attitudes towards libraries; the unclear definition of the sphere of autonomy for public libraries coupled with their relative isolation in each community; and the problematic nature of goal definition for public libraries.

In this chapter we turn our attention to a more detailed examination of what library administrators and other commentators have to say about the specific behavioral expectations of librarians and library administrators as well as the areas in which norm conflict arises, perceived or unperceived, and evidence of the consequences of such conflict. The literature analysis is presented as a consensus of professional attitudes and expectations.

The Library and Librarianship as a Social Organization for Librarians

The public library sets the boundaries of the librarian's life; its hierarchy reflects his past, present, and future.¹ The librarian is dependent on the library as a system for his employment, for recommendations to work in other libraries, and to a large extent for training in his work. He there acquires not only new or improved skills, but also a knowledge of the values, norms, structure and functions of his occupation and of the organization in which this occupation functions. His materials and the system are not his own as are those of a "private" profession, such as medicine or law; instead, they are a part of an environing system, the local government which represents the public he is to serve. Early in his career he is faced with the manifold and ambiguous goals of his organization. He is part of a structure that is based on the ideals of "learning", yet more often than not he must become a specialist, often remote from scholarly pursuits. He learns that limited local finances and interests sharply curtail the possibility of developing a "representative" collection of books and materials, although one of his occupation's most prominent norms tells

him that this kind of collection is essential. Indeed, he suspects that it is perhaps undesirable for any one library to acquire a collection representative of our entire culture, for the production of library materials is so vast that it makes such a practice unfeasible. While he knows that all parts of the organization are important, he sees that libraries vary in their emphasis on these parts, that the parts are "unequal". "Reference" may stand higher in the hierarchy in one library; "circulation", in another; and so on.

Librarians are clear in understanding their administrative hierarchy, however; they understand the lines of authority and responsibility with which they must work. Such things as orders, suggestions and complaints tend to follow authorized channels.

By and large librarians are satisfied in their work.² They like particularly the special, professional tasks such as compiling bibliographies. They tend to look at their work as a whole and enjoy the sense of "endlessness", of continuity, in it. The most satisfying aspect is public service -- "getting the right books to the right people." The many routine and dull tasks, including shelving, arranging, taking inventory, are among the "un-professional" duties, requiring little imagination or skill. In fact, the most general source of strain or dissatisfaction is the occupation's uncertainty about itself, uncertainty about the distinction between professional and non-professional work and status. However, librarians are quite clear and realistic about the relationship between administration and career. A brighter future is perceived of as moving upwards in the administrative hierarchy rather than turning to more scholarly work or more intensive development of particular skills.

In many occupations one may enhance occupational status by cultivating larger or richer clienteles and by improving one's technical-professional skills. In librarianship the size or character of the clientele can be but little controlled by an individual librarian, for such limits are generally expanded only by the organization as a unit, with the cooperation of the local government and the public itself. Further, intensive development of professional skills is more limited in library practice as compared with many other occupations; only the teaching and research milieu of the professional library school affords much opportunity of this kind. Thus the majority of librarians see that progress to their careers depends on attaining more administrative responsibility. At the same time, the rank-and-file of librarians are probably not motivated to seek a high level in the administrative

hierarchy, for their primary orientation is toward the "traditional" library, characterized by quiet and reserve, rather than toward the modern conception of the library as a dynamic, experimental, and out-going organization.³

In spite of the pervading trait of traditionalism, there is striking evidence of two co-existing groups in the profession; the "old guard" and the "avant garde".⁴ The "old guard" is characteristically prim, moralistic in manner, and austere, and as such it serves at least as a useful measure of the distance librarianship has traveled. It helps to define such alternative traits as "glamour", camaraderie with readers, and "good" public relations -- all of which are traits of the librarian's new image. The avant garde insists on technical efficiency and respect for reading as writing as well as the development of glamorous and aggressive relationships with the community. At the present time we have no evidence of which group is numerically predominant, but the themes of the literature in the profession overwhelmingly suggest that the "old guard" traditions are still with us in major proportions and constitute a prime element in the backward state of libraries and librarianship. There is, of course, a large group that is weary of such contrasts and the considerable discussion and energy devoted to them in the occupation. This group wants to "just be librarians".

The more positive and ideal qualities of the occupation, as might be expected, are given prominence by both library schools and library associations. Students are informed of the virtues of dynamic and glamorous attitudes and behavior, and professional associations tend to reinforce this in their own pronouncements. Both seek to motivate libraries to give the best service possible in a manner that will reflect positively on the profession. Among the several other functions of the professional associations, the provision of codes and standards for the occupation and technical assistance for the implementation of these standards are also important. The American Library Association and other national as well as regional and local professional associations have been extremely active in public library affairs, acting as forums for new ideas and techniques, and publishing a very wide range of materials concerning library goals and operations. The attitudes of the memberships, however, indicate that the effectiveness of these organizations in providing motivation and guidance has not been what it was hoped to be. In responding to the Public Library Inquiry, less than one-eighth of the members of various professional associations felt that their membership helped professionally, and the number feeling them to be of personal helpfulness was also very small. A greater number felt community organizations were more helpful in their personal lives. Men tended to find that national association membership was more helpful professionally than was membership in any other kind of organization, while women felt

that regional and local library associations and community organizations were more helpful in this respect.⁵ As for their shortcomings, library schools are often criticized for being too idealistic and even more often for being too "theoretical" and failing to give adequate practical preparation for beginning workers. In general, the student leaves for his first position with rosy and general conceptions of his occupation, with some appreciation of the realities of compromise with these conceptions, and an awareness of the need to begin thinking in terms of administration as the means of developing his career and as the means for bringing into being those policies and practices that are congruent with his newly learned conceptions.

The major question arises, how well do library schools prepare their students for administrative responsibility and how do the professional associations assist them in developing administrative abilities and practices? The Public Library Inquiry attitude survey notwithstanding, there is no clear-cut, up-to-date, and objective answer to either part of this question. The teaching of library administration is extremely varied even in the accredited schools. At best it tends to consist of extensive reading about existing public library managerial operations and general administrative theories produced a generation or more ago. In his analysis of accredited library school offerings in library administration, Wasserman found that only three of the eighteen major schools taught administration as "administrative process", as distinct from a "preoccupation with the techniques and methods of the production and service functions of libraries."⁶ All librarians, he points out, need to "understand the theory and framework of administration if only to appreciate their roles in the total organization in which they function, and their relationship to it."⁷ The literature of librarianship demonstrates a lack of familiarity with management literature in general and in other fields. It largely consists of how-to-do-it articles and is primarily technical and particularistic. While this is true of the literature concerned with internal management functions, it is even more apparent that library administrative literature and instruction is almost totally remiss in analyzing and describing the relations of the library administrator with other authorities and administrators outside the library. Inter-organizational and intra-governmental relationships and problems are treated in a very cursory fashion, if at all. Consequently, graduates of library schools have little knowledge of actual or potential problems in this area and nothing but the most general and vague norms for handling such problems. This has not gone unnoticed, for many library leaders have pled for the introduction of the "human relations" approach to librarianship,⁸ and for the use of social and behavioral sciences'

"conceptual tools to bear upon the problems of library administration."⁹ To date the pleas have not been answered.

An additional general factor in the training and behavior of administrators is the widely held view among librarians that the administrator should be a scholar and bookman first and an administrator second. Proponents of this viewpoint feel that management is a minor function of libraries and can probably be performed intuitively. This view is held by several prominent library administrators, almost all of them in academic libraries, but it has pervaded the whole profession as an issue that remains unresolved. It is probable that many students are at least initially hostile to administration, that is, to its conceptualization and to its power in the profession. They tend to distrust administration much as do teachers who see in it a threat to the goals and autonomy of the educational process. Some librarians have expressed fear that library schools discourage rather than prepare recruits for the chief administrative posts in libraries.¹⁰ Justification for this fear has not been systematically analyzed, except that, as mentioned above, the schools do not present the student with a sophisticated interpretation of administration in terms of contemporary knowledge of this field of study, especially the contribution of the behavioral sciences.

Apart from the adequacy of instruction, however, other structural features of professional education and recruitment are relevant to the problem of preparation for administration. The two most important among these are the motivations of students and the sexual composition of the occupation. Individuals are attracted to librarianship primarily because they like books and reading and because they want others to share these interests, and thus to serve them. They are attracted by such functions as book processing and supplying information and guidance to individual patrons.^{11, 12} A full-time administrative position can be expected to deprive the librarian of both the opportunity for personal service and intensive involvement with the selection and reading of books. To seek career advancement, then, requires serious adjustment of one's early and primary motivation to deal directly with patrons and books and the behavior that will bring the two together, for full-time administration requires attention to tasks of a different order. It can be rationalized, of course, that administration can bring about new programs and introduce more people to library services, but the administrator himself is not likely to enjoy the personal satisfaction of giving this service. The subordinates will have the pleasure of interaction with patrons and processing more books, while the administrator must seek his satisfaction in such things as planning

and the acquisition of financial support for services. He may, of course, also enjoy the greater power that goes with his particular set of tasks and relationships.

The sexual composition of librarianship is important to every aspect of library administration. Library work is generally considered to be a woman's occupation, for only about twenty percent of librarians are men. On the other hand, the vast majority of chief administrators of medium-sized and large public libraries are men. This disproportionate representation has increased greatly in the past twenty-five years. There are many factors involved in understanding the role of women as administrators, and only the most general will be discussed here.

Librarianship is generally regarded as a service profession, one in which the primary purpose of its participants is to serve and provide assistance to the public. This aspect of the profession is thought to hold great appeal for women and to be one of the major drawing points for interest in librarianship. It is questionable whether this factor is any more appealing for the female in librarianship than for the male, but because there are greater numbers of women in the field it is assumed that the possibility for service is especially meaningful for women. It may be argued that the "emotional" or humanitarian approach of women in librarianship should give way to the more disinterested and "intellectual" orientation of other professions. But one may question the necessity or advisability of a disinterested professional approach when considering the purposes of librarianship. Indeed, one may even question the existential validity of the functionally specific, affectively neutral and universalistic characterization of professional-client relations in the traditional professions, such as medicine and law.

One factor which obviously and inevitably affects the role of women in librarianship is the probability of career interruption by way of marriage and child-rearing. The knowledge that she will quite possibly leave the profession, for a time at least, tends to create a lesser commitment to career on the part of a woman and hence a less strong dedication to the profession per se. She is less motivated for advancement in the field, and when she does assume an executive role she tends to be oriented to the local scene rather than the national professional one, and more influenced by the routine of the local bureaucracy than by collegial control.¹³ The principles of professional autonomy are less meaningful to most women in librarianship than to their male colleagues, and they are less interested in the intellectual content of the profession than in the more practical applications of "how-to-do-it".

A further factor affecting the role of women as library executives involves the role of the librarian as a representative for the organization in the local political arena. Women generally are taken less seriously than men in this regard as many believe it less suitable for women than men to be involved in political infighting. Women are thought less businesslike in their attitudes and in their methods and because of this, as well as their lesser career commitment, may well be less creative in the initiation and implementation of long range planning.¹⁴ This greatly affects the process of free communication with male trustees and officials which is absolutely essential to the steady growth of the library organization. One may even ask, "Given that the profession is regarded as 'female' do male executives enjoy less regard in this respect than other male executives?"

Finally, an expectation of discrimination in the community power structure, along with the oft-times competing family role, tends to reduce both the performance and the aspirations of women in librarianship. Female librarians tend to be of higher median age than do male, but the males tend to hold more advanced degrees and to be paid higher median salaries. Masters degrees were held by 30% of female librarians in 1960 and by 62% of the males. And doctorates were held by 11% of the males and by only 0.5% of the females.¹⁵ This may reflect somewhat the fact that late career decisions are possible in the library profession and that many women may choose the field when the necessity for such a choice becomes clear following college work or even some post-college work experience. But it may also reflect the lesser degree of commitment to the profession on the part of women, and thus affect the motivation and the performance level of the woman library executive. In any event, the female library executive cannot be said necessarily to sustain a less serious commitment or less disinterested orientation to her work than the male executive. On the other hand, the female executive certainly does not enjoy the respect of the predominantly male-led political and social structure and is clearly at a disadvantage in competing for the library in the political arena.

System of Norms for the Library Administrator

Range of Professional Expectations

The leaders of emerging professions, in an effort to confer a degree status not yet achieved, tend to posit norms that cannot be realized, and librarianship is no exception.¹⁶ The conditions of emergence also tend to make for the development of norms that are ambiguous, that range from a very idealistic and general nature to

specific how-to-do-it standards. Given the additional conditions of inadequate development of resources and technology as well as personnel, professional practitioners are often vulnerable to structured role strain.

One of the most important sources of norms for librarians' behavior consists of formal statements and informal articles authored by official library associations and eminent leaders and educators in the profession. In 1938 the American Library Association adopted a Code of Ethics for librarians which is still in effect in 1967, although it is constantly under fire for being "too boy-scoutish", "too idealistic", and "not enforceable".¹⁷ There have been and continue to be proposals for revision of the Code, but it still serves as a standard document for use in library education and is consequently important in conveying to students as well as graduates the professional ethics of their chosen occupation.

The Preamble to the Code exemplifies the vague and overly general conceptualization of professional ethics and professional identity.

The library as an institution exists for the benefit of a given constituency, whether it be the citizens of a community, members of an educational institution, or some larger or more specialized group. Those who enter the library profession assume an obligation to maintain ethical standards of behavior in relation to the governing authority under which they work, to the library constituency, to the library as an institution, and to fellow workers on the staff, to other members of the library profession, and to society in general.¹⁸

It is apparent that the librarian is confronted with the problem of developing and maintaining satisfactory relationships with several different groups. How is he to do this "ethically" when the interests and pressures of these groups conflict? The Code does not and probably could not provide such an answer, for the library administrator has such an enormous number of different tasks and relationships to fulfill that executing them competently or without compromising the "ethics" is an expectation beyond reason. For instance, two pre-eminent library administrators have outlined no less than seventeen kinds of activities for the administrator in a major textbook for the teaching of administration.¹⁹

1. Directing an EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION whose influence reaches potentially into every home, organization and place of occupation. . . . Making

books and similar materials add to the thinking power and intelligence of the people. . . .

2. Envisioning the whole COMMUNITY as awaiting fullest service, equally concerned and in contact with its industrial, business, labor, civic, social, recreational, cultural and religious groups, to see that the library knows and serves them all. . . .

3. Actively COOPERATING WITH THE SCHOOLS and other agencies to improve the methods of teaching of READING. . . to persons of all ages and abilities. . . .

4. COOPERATING WITH THE TRUSTEES, who officially constitute the library organization, seeing that each takes some active responsibility for the general policies and adequate public support of the library, especially when pressure for public funds calls for courageous and aggressive action by librarians and trustees.

5. As head of a MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT (in fact if not by law), cooperating with progressive municipal leaders in plans, projects, procedures, either directly or through the trustees.

6. MANAGING A PUBLIC BUSINESS in which buildings, equipment, and all expenditures for books and materials, but especially for salaries, are scrutinized with a view to securing full returns to the public, in an efficient and economical fashion, evaluating ideas, formulating plans and policies and making decisions, objectively and soundly.

7. Operating a DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM of materials, ideas and information aimed to reach the largest number of people with the greatest number of worthy, useful, stimulating books. . . .

8. ORGANIZING the units of service and the staff. . . laying out and dividing their activities. . . delegating and clarifying responsibilities and authority. . . modifying to advantage when opportunity arises. . . seeking simplicity in overhead, and avoiding bureaucracy and empire building.

9. STAFFING with the most able colleagues. . . .

10. Discovering, encouraging, and DEVELOPING STAFF initiative, knowledge, and ability, and securing fully adequate. . . compensation and recognition. . . .

11. SUPERVISING and reviewing the administrative METHODS and supervisory SKILLS of each department. . . .

12. Observing the SERVICE received by the public at each department. . . to be certain that the materials, methods, and spirit. . . shall be the most complete, prompt and helpful possible.

13. Drawing upon the best information and judgment. . . to select a stock of BOOKS AND MATERIALS adequate to the needs and appropriate to the constant changes in public demand, and developing within the staff that thorough knowledge of books and their values. . . .

14. By constant forethought attempting to see that the library discovers and encourages the INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN. . . to accomplish some definite purpose in any worthy field.

15. Keeping the public informed, and strengthening PUBLIC RELATIONS through. . . varied forms of PUBLICITY on the work of the library. . . .

16. Developing himself through constant challenge of his own viewpoints and methods, professional and general reading, and a sympathetic interest in SCHOLARSHIP in general made real by an avocation of research in some field.

17. COMBATTING INSTITUTIONAL INERTIA in the community and inside the library, working for sound constructive change, finding ways to overcome indifference to social problems, but refraining from "library evangelism," and not permitting the library, through any representative, to become a sounding board for any controversial attitude.

The authors are not totally unaware of the extraordinary demands that this list constitutes for the administrator, but like other writers they do not qualify the obligations in any way, they do not assign them any priority ranking, and they fail to provide any truly operable administrative techniques to fulfill them. They do ask, in describing the library director's daily work,

How can the librarian schedule the following?
Planning and decisions on policy, activities, methods, rules, etc. Conferences with trustees. Considering reports from staff. Interviews with department and branch heads. . . . Personnel interviews with candidates for employment. Interviews with readers. . . with outsiders. . . . Dictating of correspondence. And frequent visits to see what goes on inside the whole library. . . each item is important. . . thinking, planning and deciding get squeezed into nothingness in many libraries. Time-stealing telephone calls interrupt everything. And time has to be found for outside visits and conferences which keep the library in active working relations with the community. . . . If there is any time left, there is professional reading. . . activity in professional organizations. . . attention to new books. . . .20

The only solution to this dilemma is for the administrator to give short shrift to many activities and to delegate many others to assistants. This requires that he have competent personnel for the delegated tasks, while in actuality he often has only one chief assistant. Thus the administrative structure follows a fairly standard

pattern wherein the director assumes responsibility for tasks and relationships largely concerned with groups outside the library (the trustees, city officials, and community organizations), while his assistants assume responsibility for managing most of the internal affairs of the library. Nonetheless, the director is held responsible for the internal managerial duties and their consequences, and he can never long escape involvement with them. This at best leaves him with a serious problem of scheduling and planning his work in the area of external library relationships. However, personal assistance, time, and avoidance cannot solve the library executive's problems alone, for they arise from the over-reaching and ambiguous nature of the several roles he must play. His situation is quite similar in this way to that of the academic administrator about whom Stephens comments that few men can be vigorous participants in community activities and fund-raising, and at the same time be skillful executives of their organizations, maintaining awareness of developments in the field and in the organization, and judging which deserve financial emphasis.²¹

Let us suppose, however, that the library administrator enjoys a kind of "ideal" administrative structure in that he has a large enough subordinate supervisory staff to take care of the internal management of the library; he is then free to assume the responsibilities of the many external interrelationships necessary for the administration of the library. It is incumbent on him to account for many things in this arena. He is supposed to acquire the confidence of the power structure in the community and at the same time satisfy the formal and informal demands of the board and city officials. This means that he must become a civic leader, adequately participating in community planning and activities wherever and whenever the opportunity arises. It means that he is responsible for the financial health of his organization, planning and preparing budgets for the library.

The Administrator as Educator and Promoter

At the same time, as the library is an educational organization, the library administrator is an educator; this simple logical proposition constitutes one of the major concerns and characteristics of the profession. The library administrator, in spite of having duties that are primarily administrative in contrast with those of the "line" professions, is expected to be a man of learning.

The ideal librarian is, I suppose, a learned and enthusiastic polymath - a man. . . who has much or

varied learning, but whom we nowadays may define as the blessed mean between the two extremes, the man who knows more and more about less and less, and his opposite, the man who knows less and less about more and more.²²

Thus, the librarian is not to be a "narrow" specialist (although Wheeler and Goldhor recommend, as do others, that library administrators develop scholarly specializations in item sixteen above), nor is he to be a dilettante. Another prominent administrator writes.

Librarianship is a learned profession, and the library executive is or should be, well educated and well read. He has an obligation to his patrons and to his staff to be continually building on his cultural background. He should belong to the intellectual elite of his community. At the same time his chief role is to be a man of action, who makes decisions and gets things done.²³

Most library administrators assumedly enter their occupation at least partly motivated by a desire to read and to be accepted as belonging somewhere in the "intellectual elite of his community." The question arises, does being an intellectual, especially one affiliated primarily with a "safe" and "quiet" institution, conflict with being "a man of action"? As Talcott Parsons has pointed out, the librarian's generic role is characterized by conflicting strains to be educative (to press for broadening the intellectual horizons of the community), and to be passive (to be neutral, fair, and uninvolved in controversy).²⁴ The administrator as educator does not function as a line professional, giving daily face-to-face service to patrons. The administrator's educational role is to educate the community, and the board of trustees and the city officials as to the virtues and needs of the library as an educational organization. In this sense, the administrator becomes a promoter of education. As such he must be sensitive to the many needs of the community and alert to the present and potential status of the library in meeting these needs. This means that he must be knowledgeable about the community, that he must be able to assign priorities to the various programs the library may offer, and that he must be able to acquire the power to effect any such progress.

The norms of the profession emphasize the function of the library administrator as a promoter. He is supposed to be active and constructive in his community and work with the local authorities in developing ever improved library services for an ever larger library clientele. Some aspects of this role function are made clear to him in ways exemplified by the formidable list of activities

cited from Wheeler and Goldhor above. But briefly, if he is to successfully promote the library, the executive must be familiar with the community and must provide planning of library programs and initiation of these plans.

Do librarians "know their community?" The answer in the literature is uncertain. The survey research of Naegele indicates that they do, that librarians are quite aware of the various demographic, educational, and political factors in the community that affect the library.²⁵ However, other studies report that librarians are generally ignorant of the character of their communities and of important economic and social developments about which they should know.²⁶ It is certain, nevertheless, that administrators are supposed to be involved in community associations no matter how indirect the effect may be on the library. The purpose is to cultivate friendly relations with members of the "power structure" in order to establish a more positive image of the library and of the librarian. The Code of Ethics takes notice of this as follows:

Librarians should encourage a general realization of the value of library service and be informed concerning movements, organizations, and institutions whose aims are compatible with those of the library.

Librarians should participate in public and community affairs and so represent the library that it will take its place among educational, social and cultural agencies.

A librarian's conduct should be such as to maintain public esteem for the library and library work.²⁷

The pronounced moderate tone of the Code is quite apparent in this section as it is in others. The probable reason for this lies in the fear of political involvement. In recent years, however, many writers have taken a much bolder viewpoint. While a few librarians have compromised their professionalism by taking sides in active political forays, too many others have avoided politics altogether and retreated into "negativism and away from needed positive action."²⁸ Indeed, on the national level, the successes of the American Library Association with the assistance of many individual public library executives have proven that librarians can be very sophisticated and knowledgeable politically in promoting federal legislation for library services. The great success on the national level, and the evidence of the need for revitalized leadership on the local level have encouraged some librarians to reconsider the traditionally quiescent political stance of the occupation. ". . . It is time to shuck

the myth that working with political representatives is dirty business. . . we should spend far more time locally in the offices of the men who make law and wield influence. . . . Reverence is for professionals in religion. Tough dedication is for library professionals."²⁹

Such exhortations notwithstanding, the practical problem remains for the local librarian to determine how and what he shall do in his own community. There was virtually no opposition to federal legislation for libraries -- indeed, Congressmen vied with each other in presenting bills to support libraries -- but public libraries are essentially local institutions, and the local library administrator must work within the framework of his particular community. "The problem of the proponents of any public cause," says Phillip Monypenny, "is the number, intensity and techniques of their own group in relationship to the opposition which is pursuing a contrary purpose. . . . This concept of politics accepts conflict as the chief form of political action and assumes opposition for almost every political proposal."³⁰ The practical questions arising from this proposition are -- who are your friends, who are your opponents, how does one muster maximum support? Public libraries do have enough support to be recognized as governmental activities, they do get modest federal financial aid, and have managed to legally prescribe minimal standards for training in many states. Libraries are small compared with other public agencies and so represent little political threat, they have little involvement in state or federal politics, and they are generally considered as "a good thing". However, they seem to have no "natural allies"; for the minority of people who do use the library are rarely organized politically to support it, and the vast majority of non-users for whom the library is a potential benefit are similarly unorganized. And libraries do face opposition on the local level; their appeals for funds are not met sympathetically by those whose taxes would be increased. Librarians tend to feel themselves that there is no local enmity, but that apathy rather than hostility explains their failure to acquire great support. The answer to the administrator's dilemma is almost universally the same: (1) Be more realistic about the attitudes of the public; its hostility as well as apathy are effective deterrents to library growth. (2) Develop a public relations program that will inform both the vocal educated minority and the less educated majority of the actual and potential value of the library in the community. (3) The library staff, as a well-educated and organized group is capable of understanding the political system in which it works and should be able to mobilize its capacities for political action by developing relationships with the powerful groups and individuals in the community.^{31, 32}

The development of relationships with potential "friends", especially those in the "power structure", is widely considered to be of special importance. One group that should be cultivated consists of those who either directly or indirectly control local finances and other aspects of government; that is, both the local officialdom and the political figures behind them whom the librarian most often fails to cultivate. Librarians, it is said, should offer superior service to such potential friends (although they should avoid "currying favor!"), as well as the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, the Community Chest, and by regularly communicating with any and all social, hobby, recreational, and educational groups as well as labor unions, the P.T.A. and the League of Women Voters. The librarian should let school boards know how much students rely on the public library for work on daily assignments, he should show the Chamber of Commerce that extensive marketing and industrial information is available in the library, and he should show government officials, women's clubs, and wage earners how their particular interests may be served by active use of the library.^{33, 34}

While administrators are aware of the desirability of establishing such relationships, they are also aware of the extraordinary amount of time and energy such a program would entail. An executive is considered by some to be failing if he "spends too much time, thought and emphasis on outside activities that give him a sense of importance. This is not to imply that an inside administrator is superior to an outside administrator; both have their points, and a well-balanced combination is the ideal."³⁵ Considering the pervasive tradition of aloofness and isolation from community affairs, the very great needs of public libraries and their dependence on local support, it is difficult for many administrators to see how they can spend "too much time" on outside activities! Nonetheless, the norm to promote through community and "political" activities and the norm to supervise the operations of the library do present a problem of selecting and balancing the executive's efforts.

Penland's excellent survey of Michigan public library executives shows that the majority of librarians are not primarily concerned with promoting cooperative educational programs in the community, although such programs are officially part of library standards.³⁶ "Many librarians are happy doing a small neat job like a craftsman. . . they remain handmaidens to learning and prey to fads in program development."³⁷ This state of affairs exists, Fenland says, because librarians do not feel the responsibility to help all citizens to become "purposeful readers". Yet standards such as these, with full

professional support, are essential to combat the local control groups in the community who want to reduce costs and public services.³⁸ The failure to plan, which is in large part the result of inadequate criteria for creating plans, means that most librarians live "from crisis to crisis". They rely on past formulas and intuitive judgment to solve problems, and such solutions are all too often haphazard and opportunistic.³⁹

To promote in accordance with the professional norms means that the librarian must often initiate relationships, ideas and programs as well as volunteer the services of the library to already existing community programs. Just as he is often reluctant to co-sponsor such activities he is reluctant to try the even more difficult task of initiating such action, of assuming leadership. On the other hand, there is evidence of other criteria by which librarians judge themselves and each other. For example, a "good" administrator is one who "has an efficiently running library; the circulation department is pleased if more books are borrowed; and the readers' advisor is gratified when people ask his advice. Library service to people is thereby fragmented and distorted."⁴⁰ Thus, although the norms and standards of the profession emphasize qualitative assessment of one's work, librarians tend to assess their work in quantitative terms, compiling "statistics" on such items as circulation of materials and the number of readers.⁴¹ One writer refers to this as "librarymanship". . . . the "preoccupation with quantitative data", which is supposed to be discarded and replaced by programs emphasizing qualitative performance.⁴² Unrefined circulation figures, for instance, have little meaning. Are works by Henry Miller, Boris Pasternak, and Erle Stanley Gardner each equal to "one"? Where are the sophisticated analyses of the characteristics of cardholders, of their reading needs and habits, and of special library services?

The inability or lack of interest on the part of many librarians to adhere to certain norms of the profession -- to actively promote the library in the community and to plan and assess their work in accordance with professional standards -- presents a dilemma of broad dimensions. Many administrators insist that the norms are unrealistic, that they presume an unattainable level of financial support and an excessive variety of functions for the executive. Probably the most important factor, however, is one that is generally ignored; that is, the structure of the relationships of the library and the library executive with his community, his board of trustees and the local government. These relationships are almost invariably assumed to be standard throughout all communities. It is as if the political and governmental

structure of American communities were fixed variables that could be manipulated by the executive if only he were properly motivated to do so. This is not the case, for all of these relationships vary considerably from community to community and these variations have not been systematically analyzed for better understanding of the executive's role.

The executive's role and dilemmas, then, are more complicated than they appear to be in the literature of the profession. The executive must contend with the professional norms to improve standards, but he has few operational guides or sanctions to fulfill these norms, and he is relatively isolated from the profession, unable to enjoy whatever support might be forthcoming from collegial contacts. His "image" and influence varies with community sensitivity to the value of his organization and occupation, yet he is urged to promote the library and to do so without compromising it politically. He must contend with local norms to reduce costs and operate an "efficient" organization. He is faced with the local pressures and problems personally and daily, and these local pressures are consequently more salient than those of the profession. As a result, it is commonly felt that, "The administrator is fundamentally loyal first to the administration for whom he works" rather than to the profession.⁴³ Evidence of the patterns and variations of the library executive's relations with the community as well as his board and local officials will be presented in Chapter IV.

The Library Executive's Relations with his Board and Government

The foregoing discussion of the several problems and norms of librarianship and the general role of the public library in society outlines the framework within which the library executive works. In any given community, however, it is the chief librarian who is primarily responsible for the library in terms of satisfying both the demands of the community and the standards of his occupation. Indeed, in his community, the chief librarian is "the" librarian. The library administrator is much esteemed by his professional colleagues and is increasingly respected in his community. Present-day requirements for this position include a professional degree in librarianship, administrative professional experience, and usually some experience demonstrating leadership ability, that is, ability to design and manage library programs. The rewards for administrators are also relatively high. The chief librarian's income is quite respectable, at least in comparison with other municipal or county officials.

The average (mean) annual salary for head librarians in cities of 50,000 to 100,000 population was \$10,015 in 1966; the range was \$3,922 to \$15,204. Librarians in larger cities of 100,000 to 250,000 earned \$11,379 on the average, with a range of \$8,144 to \$18,690. These salaries are very nearly the same as those paid to other local officials, such as auditors, controllers, recreation directors, personnel officers and engineers; and they are significantly less than only those of the superintendents of schools and city managers.⁴⁴ The average salaries provide some indication of the importance of the chief librarian. However, the ranges of salaries suggest that there is a great variation in the community's evaluation of this position, with some incumbents earning from three to four times as much as their colleagues serving similarly sized populations. More substantial insights into the role of the administrator in his individual community can be obtained by examining the various patterns of norms to which he is subject in his special position.

The library administrator is obligated to work with two distinct governing bodies in achieving the goals of the library: the board of trustees and the local government. His relationships with the local government are usually divided yet further into those with the elected, legislative body, and the appointed managerial officials. The professional norms and goals may not be congruent with any of these groups, and these groups may among themselves disagree about the goals of the library and the proper behavior of the library administrator. The administrator will find only minimal guidance from the literature of his occupation in this complex interrelationship. Following are relevant excerpts from the Code of Ethics for Librarians:

The librarian should perform his duties with realization of the fact that final jurisdiction over the administration of the library rests in the officially constituted governing authority. This authority may be vested in a designated individual, or in a group such as a committee or board.

The chief librarian should keep the governing authority informed on professional standards and progressive action. Each librarian should be responsible for carrying out the policies of the governing authority and its appointed executives with a spirit of loyalty to the library.

Criticism of library policies, service, and personnel should be offered only to the proper authority for the sole purpose of improvement of the library.⁴⁵

Earlier in this paper the overall legal jurisdiction as well as the historical role of the board of trustees was described. The library's board is in most cases appointed by either the legislative body, such as a board of aldermen or of county commissioners, or the chief elected official of the governmental unit. The board is legally responsible for the library in the sense that it, rather than the librarian or the legislative body, has the power to make the policies of the library, especially those concerning its financial affairs. It is usually also its job to appoint the chief librarian who acts both to inform the board of what he feels should be done and to carry out the board's policy decisions. Ninety-five percent of American public libraries are governed by boards, and 75% of head librarians are board appointed.^{46, 47} The library is one of the few public institutions with such a legal arrangement that interposes a formal authority between the executive of the organization and the executive and legislative branches of the local government. While the historical reasons for this have been identified, there is reason to believe that this governing structure is no longer compatible with present day needs. Does the board truly act as a "buffer", protecting the library from political involvement? Does it effectively represent the community? Can it provide the kind of guidance that is needed for library development?

These and similar questions have arisen because of the changes in librarianship and in local government in the past several years. To begin with, while there is general agreement that the board's role is policy-making and that it is the librarian's duty to suggest programs to the boards and administer approved programs, in practice the distinction between policy-making and administrative functions is not so sharp. Partly as a consequence, librarians have often been inclined to load boards with detail and to carry on policy largely in accordance with their own predispositions.⁴⁸ Further, many students of the field claim that relations between board and librarian depend more on local conditions and personalities than on either law or administrative machinery.

There are, however, several underlying characteristics of contemporary public administration that have led to the general reshaping of library-government relations. They are (1) the concentration of city authority in a single executive, (2) modern budget and finance procedures, (3) civil service and progressive personnel practices, and (4) centralized purchasing. This growth in the complexity of local government has led to the introduction of intermediary governmental officials such as budget bureau officials who stand between the library and political and legislative officers. At the same time, library

administration has become more "professionalized" -- more and more librarians are grounded in the principles and procedures of public administration, especially those concerning fiscal and personnel administration. The professional personnel and finance officers in local government expect librarians, like other governmental agency heads, to "speak their language". Boards often cannot communicate as effectively and consequently tend to move out of actual library administration (as had frequently been their wont) and leave it to the professionals. The mechanization of technical services in libraries further increases the distinction between the professional and the layman. Furthermore, the very growth of libraries in size, the increased complexity of their operations and services, and the larger number of branch facilities seem to require a more "professionalized" administration. Consequently, some administrators write that, like it or not, they are drawn into the political arena by being brought into the policy and procedural decisions of city or county management.

There are several features of library boards that add to the pressure for closer relationships between the librarian and the local government. A prominent factor that affects the interrelationships of librarians, boards and government is the acceptance in both law and library tradition that librarians as professionals are subordinate to lay boards and officials. This gives rise to questions about the relative merits of lay and professional knowledge and judgments, as well as authority. Not only may boards be unable to grasp the current problems and language of modern administration, they also are frequently not truly representative of the community, either in terms of their own socio-economic statuses or their willingness or desire to consider the interests of various class or interest groups in the community. Boards are largely upper middle class in composition and essentially conservative and protective in their outlooks. Many board members lack a strong enthusiasm for their positions and as they are often "cavalierly appointed and similarly regarded,"⁴⁹ they tend to be quiescent and unaggressive in championing the cause of the library. In terms of law, of course, the trustees are the primary representative of the library and governing officials are secondary. Trustees, not the librarian, are expected to assume the responsibility for such fundamental problems as seeking funds for the library. Indeed, according to some critics, if the librarian has to plead for funds, the trustees and the public have both failed in their responsibilities!^{50, 51} Consequently the librarian is by law dependent on the board for acquiring funds, and is reminded by at least some members of the profession that it is "unprofessional to beg". He must, however, work with legislators and

officials in planning the budget, and it would seem highly unlikely that he would not at the same time be promoting the interests of the library by trying to maximize the amount of support he can get. This may not be "pleading for funds", but it is also certainly not avoiding opportunities to promote interest in the library's financial needs.

Many administrators feel that their boards are quite unconcerned about the library and are often reluctant even to appear at meetings. The library executive in contrast is continuously thinking of the library. He is always mindful of the attitudes of fiscal authorities and of the subordinate department heads who can make recommendations to the appropriations authorities.⁵² Trustees may be primarily responsive to the political group that appointed them; their goals may consequently be quite different than those of the library profession or the library executive. This is especially likely to occur if the board member is mainly motivated to exploit his position for the prestige it brings him. In communities with relatively inactive or apathetic library clienteles, the unresponsive board and city government can be very troublesome for the librarian. Active clienteles, however, can provide great support for the librarian's ambitions for his organization; they can by virtue of their political and social power influence both boards and governments to respect the library's needs and requests.⁵³ The support of an active and sympathetic clientele may afford the librarian an element of political power and consequently ability to initiate policy if he chooses.

Often the traditional role of the librarian as being subject to lay control is irrelevant. The question is less what ought to happen than what will happen in any given situation. A "strong" librarian with a "weak" board may dominate the policy-making as well as the administration of the library, and a "weak" librarian with either a weak or a strong board may make for little development or innovation in the library. The usual definition of board-librarian relations does serve a purpose as an organizational fiction or myth, especially for recruits. Also, it is effective if the board and other governing bodies believe that there are professional areas that should be respected. The librarian gains additional bargaining power if his knowledge and practices, as a professional, are considered essential and his decisions and opinions are consequently deferred to. The extent to which boards appreciate the professional nature of the librarian is not known. On the one hand it is felt that boards should respect carefully the librarian's superior knowledge, and on the other it is felt that boards should be active and strong, initiating policy and aggressively

promoting the library. It is generally implied in administrative writings that the board's interests are allied with those of the profession and that there is little conflict between the executive and his board in initiating policy.

The city manager and his staff constitute a third element in this complicated relationship. Only in recent years has the role of this third party attracted much attention in the literature of librarianship, although government by city or county manager system has been widespread for many years. Twenty years ago Oliver Garceau wrote, "The fundamental fact. . . about board and librarian dealings with government is the profound ignorance of library business in city hall or the county court. It is very small potatoes in most cases."⁵⁴ In some communities the library and its board is virtually an autonomous unit with little relationship to the central government. In most communities the importance of the library as a municipal or county agency has been so slight, in terms both of its budget and the scope of its operations, that it has merited little attention from the government. Only in the past decade or so, as the appreciation for reading, "enlightenment", continuing education, and the stress on independent study increased, did the importance of the local library increase in the eyes of local government. This change meant that more money must be spent on library programs, and that more knowledge about the means of operating the library must be acquired.

With an informed, "library-minded" city manager, a library executive might expect to develop a far more productive relationship than he could with his board. City officials and legislators might well question the role of the politically appointed board of trustees in determining the disposition of public funds. With the increasing emphasis on the professionalization of government in general they might well be expected to turn to the library executive as the chief authority on policy and other budget affairs rather than to the board. In this sense, librarians are perceived and accepted as professionals in contrast with the lay character of boards.

However, one astute and experienced administrator has pointed out that there are serious deficiencies in librarianship that constitute possible sources of difficulty in the relationship between the librarian and city officials. They include (1) the lack of authoritative writings for many areas of library administration, (2) the paucity of research -- policy often stems from past procedures rather than from systematic study and analysis of possible policies, (3) the need for performance standards -- present standards are set for

minimum, barely essential levels of performance, and (4) the difficulty of agreeing on personnel needs, such as the lack of uniformity in classifying professional work and distinguishing it from non-professional work.⁵⁵

In brief, the librarian may be expected to have at his command certain administration techniques that the profession has not been able to provide him. No matter how great his zeal, the lack of administrative abilities is a source of difficulty in satisfying the demands of his position. At the same time he may be expected to be a promoter to a greater extent than is expected of many government agencies, such as the police or sanitation departments. The role of promoter has to be reconciled with the managerial role, the concern for unit costs and efficiency. The administrator can improve his esteem with the government by introducing methods that reduce unit costs, yet he should at the same time be introducing new programs that will require additional funds. To economy-minded officials of over-taxed communities the reduction of agency costs is very appealing, but the request for money for new services may meet with little sympathy or support. If the library's board, frequently consisting of property owners and large tax payers, also is reluctant to accept the request for additional revenues, the librarian is left with little support for initiating new services. However, he may find that there is considerable gratification from all quarters in being considered an efficient manager of a "tightly run ship". Indeed, the role of the efficient manager is highly approved by the profession as well.

Administrators consequently often tend to devote their main energies to improving the operation of the library in order to effect economies which will allow modest channeling of these "saved" funds into new services. His appeals for more funds are usually moderate and the result of considerable compromise with actual needs, but he retains a positive image of an efficient and business-like manager. In any event, the formal structure of library government gives little evidence of what the institution needs, of what must be done to maintain or develop it, or of who controls it.⁵⁶

Summary

Some of the conflicts of the library executive can now be brought more clearly into focus. He must deal with a board whose desires and abilities in librarianship are often insignificant when compared to his own. Most boards have neither the training nor the time to set policy for the library, and, as Kroll points out, "It is our impression

that the boards of the most active, and by most standards, most successful libraries were those who received their spark and many of their ideas from the librarians."⁵⁷ On the other hand, the board of trustees is invested with the legal power to control library government, and although the librarian often circumvents the board in dealing with both the public and the local government, he must remember where the formal power lies in order to maintain a satisfied, useful board for his organization. Thus, there exists a very delicate situation with which the librarian must deal inoffensively if he is to lead the board in reaching his objectives with the local hierarchy. Further conflict arises as the board acts as a buffer between government and the librarian. In his study of libraries in the Pacific Northwest, Kroll drew some conclusions which may well reflect the state of library executives nationally.

The concept of the board as buffer or shield would seem to us to be in conflict with two recent trends in the world of librarianship and American public life. In librarianship we have seen the growth and ascendancy of the professional librarian, a person trained not only in the technical skills of her profession but in administration as well, a person who should be competent to plead the cause of her institution and its program before city officials; certainly the professional librarian should be capable of maintaining a close administrative working relationship with municipal officers. At the same time we have seen the development and growth of professional administration in the field of local government. More and more, especially in the offices of mayors and city managers, we see professionally skilled personnel, finance and other officers who bring to the city a degree of professional competence and the strong ethical commitments that characterize effective governmental administration as well.

We have no intention of exaggerating this trend to the point of naivete. . . . We know full well that a number of cities in the Pacific Northwest leave much to be desired in the way they are run. At the same time, to consider it a primary function of the board to act as a buffer between library and council is an anachronism we should discard in principle. Most of the competent professional librarians in the region are more than able to plead their cases before all comers, and they do well as negotiators and bargainers with their peers on other levels of government.⁵⁸

More specific causes of conflict and the methods employed to deal with them will be discussed in the following chapter, as data gained from the interviews with individual library executives are elaborated.

References

1. Kaspar D. Maegle and Elaine Culley Stolar, "The Librarian of the Northwest," in Pacific Northwest Library Association Library Development Project Reports, Vol. IV: Libraries and Librarians of the Pacific Northwest, ed. by Norton Kroll (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), p. 59.
2. Ibid., p. 107.
3. Alice I. Bryan, The Public Librarian. (A Report of the Public Library Inquiry) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 441.
4. Maegle, op. cit., pp. 72-73.
5. Bryan, op. cit., pp. 139-140.
6. Paul Wasserman, "Development of Administration in Library Service: Current Status and Future Prospects," College and Research Libraries, XIX, no. 4 (July, 1958), 287.
7. Ibid.
8. Maurice A. Tauber, "Introduction," Library Trends, VI, no. 2 (October, 1957), 107.
9. Wasserman, op. cit., 293.
10. Bryan, op. cit., p. 315.
11. Patrick R. Fenland, "Are your Attitudes Showing?," Library Journal, LXXXVI, no. 2 (January 15, 1961), 198.
12. Joseph L. Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, Practical Administration of Public Libraries (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 45.
13. Richard Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson, "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semiprofessions," Unpublished manuscript, 1966, pp. 51-59.
14. Ibid., p. 36.
15. Henry T. Drennan and Richard L. Darling, Library Manpower: Occupational Characteristics of Public and School Librarians (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966), p. 5.
16. Frank Alan Burtner, "The Vo-Ag Teacher: An Inquiry into the Status and Role of an Emergent Profession" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1957), p. 76.
17. John F. Anderson, "Ethics: The Creaking Code," Library Journal, XCI, no. 19 (November 1, 1966), 5333.

18. Myllis E. Wright, ed., American Library and Book Trade Annual, 1961 (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1960), p. 109.
19. Wheeler and Goldhor, op. cit., pp. 73-74.
20. Ibid., p. 80.
21. Richard W. Stephens, "The Academic Administrator: The Role of the University President (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1956), p. 19
22. Sir Frank Francis, "The Ideal Librarian," Library Journal, LXXXVIII, no. 2 (January 15, 1963), 185.
23. R. Russell Kunn, "Present-Day Library Executives," Library Trends, VII, no. 3 (January, 1959), 398.
24. Talcott Parsons, "Implications of the Study," in The Climate of Book Selection, ed. by J. Periam Danton (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1959), p. 94.
25. Naegele, op. cit., p. 87.
26. Kenneth E. Beasley, "The Changing Library Scene," Library Journal, LXXXVIII, no. 16 (September 15, 1963), 3158.
27. Wright, op. cit., pp. 110-111.
28. Morris Greene, "The Library in the Great Game of Politics," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXXVIII, no. 7 (March, 1964), p. 539.
29. Wyman Jones, "The Administrative Conscience," Library Journal XC, no. 16 (September 15, 1965), 3541.
30. Phillip Monypenny, "The Public Library as a Pressure Group," Illinois Libraries, XLIII, no. 10 (December, 1961), 722.
31. Guy G. Garrison, "Who are the Friends of the Library?," Illinois Libraries, XLIII, no. 10 (December, 1961), 717.
32. Monypenny, op. cit., 726.
33. Garrison, op. cit., 713
34. Monypenny, op. cit., 730.
35. Wheeler and Goldhor, op. cit., p. 47.
36. Penland, op. cit., 195.
37. Ibid.
38. Mary Lee Bundy, "Conflict in Libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXVII, no. 4 (July, 1966), 256.
39. Paul Wasserman, "Policy Formulation in Libraries," Illinois Libraries, XLIII, no. 10 (December, 1961), 774.
40. Penland, op. cit., 195.
41. Kaspar D. Naegele, "Librarians: Observations on the Work and their Careers in the Pacific Northwest," Unpublished manuscript, 1959, p. 78.
42. Beasley, op. cit., 3159.
43. Bundy, op. cit., 256.

44. Municipal Year Book, 1966 (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1966), p. 165.
45. Wright, op. cit., p. 111.
46. Harold L. Hamill, "Relations with Local Government Agencies," in Local Public Library Administration, ed. by Roberta Bowler (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1964), p. 52.
47. Harry H. Peterson, "Public Library Organization," in Local Public Library Administration, ed. by Roberta Bowler (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1964), p. 98.
48. Oliver Garceau, The Public Library in the Political Process. (A Report of the Public Library Inquiry) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), pp. 82, 86.
49. Morton Kroll, "Public Library Boards of Trustees," in Pacific Northwest Library Association Library Development Project Reports, Vol. I: The Public Libraries of the Pacific Northwest, ed. by Morton Kroll (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960), p. 139.
50. Gerald W. Johnson, "Role of the Public Library," in Public Library Service, A Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards, American Library Association, Public Library Division, Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards (Chicago: American Library Association, 1956), pp. xi-xii.
51. Robert D. Franklin, "The Administrator and the Board," Library Trends, XI, no. 1 (July, 1962), 64.
52. Harold W. Tucker, "Administrative Antennae in the Fifties," Library Trends, VII, no. 3 (January, 1959), 408.
53. Monypenny, op. cit., 339-340.
54. Garceau, op. cit., p. 88.
55. Hamill, op. cit., pp. 58-59.
56. Monypenny, op. cit., 339.
57. Kroll, op. cit., p. 142.
58. Kroll, op. cit., pp. 176-177.

CHAPTER IV

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY ADMINISTRATOR: INTERVIEW REPORTS

Introduction

To this point we have examined the duties and the norms of the library executive and the general structure, formal and informal, within which he works, as described in "ideal" terms by the literature on administration of libraries and with some information based on survey research. With the data from panel interviews we can appraise more clearly the actual interpersonal milieu of the library executive as well as his perceived foci of role pressure and strain. Additionally, facts about selected personal traits are identified. Emphasis is on the expectations of the executive, his norms for the role, and the kind of behavior he considers appropriate for resolving role conflict to the end of describing a modal type of library executive.

The Modal Public Library Executive

Personal Background Characteristics and Career

Of the nine administrators interviewed, six were male and three were female. The women were somewhat older, two in the 50-59 year and one in the 40-49 year groups; while four of the men were between 40 and 49 years old and two were between 50 and 59 years old. All but one of the men were married and one of the women was married. All had acquired an advanced professional degree in library science. The average number of years in administration for both sexes is about 14 years. However, only one of the women had any previous experience on this level (for three years) while only one of the men did not have previous experience. Three of the men were completing their second year of work in the present position with from 6 to 12 years experience in a similar position in another community. All three of these men had replaced women in their present positions. The average tenure for men in their present positions was 10 years and that for women was 15 years. Nearly all of the previous administrative experience of the men was in nearby libraries in the state, although three

of them had worked for varying periods in other states.

Four members of the panel were natives of North Carolina, two were born elsewhere in the South or Southwest, and three in the Midwest. None of them felt that their place of birth affected their relationships in the community seriously, but did feel that in many of the regional "rural" or smaller public libraries not being a native of the area can mean not being accepted readily, for the idea of a "stranger" in the community would be labelled "foreign" and would be greeted unfavorably. One administrator suggested that it actually helps to be from another community in order to help avoid identification with one or another interest group. Another finds that he is expected, as a "native son" and member of a prominent local family, to participate much more in civic and social groups than would otherwise be the case. Indeed, the demands are often so frequent that they distract him from his work. On the whole, however, this kind of local affiliation is found to be helpful in gaining access to many community organizations that may be of benefit to the library.

All felt that their communities were too "sophisticated" or "urbane" to care about the origins of the librarian. It should be noted, however, that there are some sectional differences that are relevant. The eastern part of the state is reputedly more conservative, politically and socially, than the central and western sections. It was settled earlier and has many well-to-do families of early descendants. It is a region of small towns and small cities with agriculture prior in importance to industry. (Reluctance to promote economic improvement and growth has provoked criticism from the state capital). Libraries in this region are very modest in size, almost exclusively staffed with women, and exhibit little of the vigor and planning characteristics of the central region, especially. Libraries are apparently considered less important here than in other regions; they are considered primarily useful only to women and children and consequently command little public attention and public support.

These executives have had many occupational alternatives to their library careers, and the majority of them had early work experiences in other fields, notably teaching and business. All of them, however, had been exposed at college age to the possibility of a library career, and those who went on to teach or work in other areas returned in their late twenties or early thirties to librarianship and have remained there since. All but one are firmly committed to librarianship as a vocation and career, and all intend to remain in

administration rather than turning to other activity in the field. "It's all I know how to do," was a typical response of the men, and both men and women felt that they were definitely needed in their posts. The administrative aspects of library work were not as clearly satisfactory to the women, but none of them seriously was considering changing jobs. Only one respondent felt that "if he had it to do over again" he would elect another career; for him the intellectual character and discipline of science make it a preferable field of work. There are however, important sources of personal dissatisfaction with administrative work. Too many tasks and too many "contacts" are required. Universally these executives felt that the authorities over them did not adequately understand or support the library. They were extremely realistic, however, and were quite willing to accept many of the excess demands but did feel very dismayed that their work was not properly appreciated. The isolation from other professional librarians, the low prestige of the profession and the isolation of librarians from many parts of the community, and the executive's isolation from his "public" were also sources of some dissatisfaction. Everyone found his strongest source of satisfaction in giving "service". That the executive's role in providing library service largely consists of developing "good" relations with outside officials and the board was not so consistently perceived by all members of the panel. On the other hand, "running a tight ship", maintaining discipline and morale within the library and demonstrating effective and efficient management were clearly sources of pride for many. Stability and continuity of work, working with books and literate patrons, a pleasant "atmosphere" -- all are conducive to satisfactory conditions in this position.

Status of the Administrator and Attitudes towards his Role

The three women administrators felt that they ranked very low in esteem in comparison with other administrators in the community government. Although all were treated ordinarily in a courteous fashion, as one woman put it, "only the dog catcher rates lower!" In contrast the men felt that they ranked somewhere near the middle or the top -- the fact that the library is considered a "female" organization limited their prospects for maximum prestige, but in spite of this they felt very highly respected. In communities with many other government administrators, the librarian may rank relatively lower than his colleagues in other towns. Indeed, most of the men felt that much prestige is earned by the individual in any community. He may be initially considered a well-educated but "innocent nut", but if he does his job well he will become quite respected.

While the educational level of library executives is important in commanding prestige, the size of the library staff and budget is relatively small. Police chiefs especially are often far more esteemed because of the size of their organizations and the presumably greater responsibility and managerial ability. The salaries of executives is one indicator of the value placed on their worth to the community. Male interviewees average approximately \$12,850 a year; females, about \$8,600. Few county or municipal officials (city and county managers, directors of public welfare) earn more than this, while salaries for such positions as accountants and police executives are about the same. The male librarians are by and large employed in larger communities than the females, and governmental salaries generally increase with city size. While the female librarian salary average is greatly under that of the male, the difference between salaries for female librarians and male officials in the same governmental jurisdiction is not so great; librarian salaries for executives is in the top half of salary ranges in all communities. In fact, the average annual salary for all public library heads in this state is only about \$7,000 if we include the smallest municipal, county and regional library systems.¹

The library executive is a very busy person, faced daily with a large number of routine and new tasks. With the exception of two female directors, they felt that the most important of their tasks involved relationships with individuals and groups outside the library, especially the board and city or county officials. These relationships are primarily concerned with acquiring more financial support for the library, either directly as in planning budgets or getting advice on particular items in the budget, or indirectly through public relations meetings, consulting with relevant persons about the existing and planned services of the library. Second in importance -- and first to two of the directors -- is internal management, the supervision of staff and "development" of relationships with the staff.

The dimension of time as contrasted with importance characterizes executive tasks quite differently: only one director claimed that external activities took up most of his time! Internal management, including employing and maintaining staff, "clerical duties", the preparation of reports and plans all take up a great deal of the time of these executives. This is due to the lack of adequate middle managerial positions that should account for much of this work and to the rapid growth of several of these libraries. While all welcomed the newfound, albeit modest, funds and services from federal, state and local sources, they found that a great deal of work necessarily

spent on the preparation of reports, statistical compilations, alternative building and budget plans and the like interfered with what seemed to them to be more important -- the involvement in relationships that will bring more immediate and effective results, relationships that must be established but that are too often precluded by the demands of preparatory and even clerical tasks.

The range of "internal" versus "external" activities varies considerably, however. One director does spend the major portion of each day -- and evening -- with groups outside the library in promoting and explaining his organization. Another is essentially an "outside" man; although he spends somewhat more than half of his time with his staff, the time is spent with staff supervisors in determining managerial policies and procedures -- their execution and the supervision of all tasks is left to these supervisors. Other directors, however, spend as much as half their time in supervising staff operations, selecting new materials for the library, overseeing plant maintenance (even janitorial services!), and even typing their own reports.

When asked what they would tell a person who was considering taking a similar position, all emphasized the need for a "sense of mission", a strong motivation to serve in spite of the demands of the job and its frustration, both in terms of lack of goal attainment and of having adequate time, staff, and materials to work towards the goals in a truly "executive" fashion. One must not be "emotional" or one will fail. A "bookish" person may not be happy as an administrator; there is little time or energy left for reading or opportunity to communicate about reading with library patrons. One must be a salesman as well as a manager; business experience is considered especially helpful. In addition to the loss of pleasant contacts with patrons and books, one finds the relationships with boards often problematic, even hostile. As one very experienced and respected director said, "Administrators are not trained for their jobs. They just grow into them as the job grows." Considerable frustration is felt because of the nature of the job itself and because of the lack of preparation for it. In spite of this, it will be recalled that none would seriously consider changing jobs and that they find their work challenging and thus rewarding, in spite of the frustrations.

While administrators enjoy considerably higher prestige than do their subordinate staff members, they find that the generally low public valuation of librarians diminishes administrative prestige and power. Generally, the negative aspects of the image of the librarian in the

community include "rigidity", over-emphasis on rules, gentility, a "willingness to work for nothing", being "over-intellectual and not hard working like ministers and teachers", and a lack of warmth. At the same time, administrators felt that the positive image of librarians held by the majority of the library's patrons stands in direct contrast -- that librarians are extremely helpful, "it's the only public agency in town that gives cordial personal service," that they are knowledgeable and resourceful, courteous and industrious! Younger members of the community are more likely to resent the discipline and "quiet" rules of the library. Nearly everyone fails to understand the distinction between the professional and non-professional staff, expecting non-professionals to give professional service and becoming impatient or resentful when their requests are frustrated. More and more people see the librarian as a research specialist and consequently expect more of him and respect him more. While this improvement of public esteem is welcome, most administrators find that the shortage of professional personnel creates considerable public resentment. Furthermore, as the reading and research requirements of the public increases in sophistication, the level of knowledge and education of the librarian must be advanced; some administrators felt that the quality of training for librarians is becoming inadequate for growing intellectual demands.

In most instances, the library executive finds it difficult to "get himself taken seriously". People generally respect him and are at least moderately interested in library affairs, but they do not accept him with the degree of importance that he feels is appropriate. Many people who might be expected to "know better" are often surprised to learn that library executives are paid as well as they are. The best way to acquire respect is to be able to talk in businesslike terms with city officials and businessmen. Men with business backgrounds feel that they have a distinct advantage in developing personal and organizational relationships. It is far easier for men to "mix" and to "wheel and deal" than it is for women, but men executives expressed rather more concern and indignation about this than did the women. Women executives were aware that they were paid less than their male colleagues and that they will probably be replaced by men. However, they did not feel that the library suffered in any way because the head librarian was female. The community and its government, they pointed out, expect the librarian to be reserved and unaggressive, and they respect a "good" female administrator. They did regret not being able to cultivate informal relationships with important community officials and understood that these would be very helpful to the library.

Whether or not it is easier to get salary increases and allied benefits for a staff member who is male is uncertain. The implication in many situations is that the administrator does not make an issue of the sex composition of his staff, but feels that males can and do command more money. In some communities the distinction is made quite clear by official responses to requests for increased salaries such as "she's getting enough for a woman." Nearly all administrators were troubled by an additional complication, the public assumption that male librarians may be "effeminate" or homosexual. Female administrators were perhaps more sensitive about this than males; they have had admonitions and fears expressed by board members and city officials even when no male librarian had ever been employed in the community. Male administrators expressed less concern about this problem, although they, too, had been confronted with it. Ten years after his appointment one administrator was told by a friend, who had been of primary importance in his being appointed, that prior to his appointment it was assumed that being a male librarian "he was probably a pansy" and that he had been nearly eliminated from being interviewed for the position. The ten year period had evidently made for a striking change of opinion about male librarians in this community. Other male librarians reported similar if less dramatic incidents in adjusting to their communities. The rate of replacement of female by male librarians suggests that while the fear of male librarians still exists it is not as important as the feeling that the job calls for a man rather than a woman.

Further indication of the respondents' attitudes about their positions appeared in their comparisons of the library with other organizations. The public school system and other educational organizations were said to be "most like" the library, but there was also a great deal of feeling that businesses were also similar; although the goals of businesses and libraries are not seen as being at all the same, conducting library affairs in a businesslike manner with appropriate concern for modern fiscal and management methods was quite important to the panel. On the other hand, businesses were also identified as being "least like" libraries in that businesses are seen as "selfish", "out for profit", and rarely concerned with intellectual problems. Organizations such as the American Legion and the Ku Klux Klan were also frequently mentioned as being quite the opposite of the library in their functions and purposes. Sensitivity to such organizations which have often acted as censors or otherwise opposed free expression of thought and reading in these communities was very strong among most administrators.

The features of a "good administrator" voiced by the panel emphasized the librarian's sense of mission, the need to like working both with people and with books. Business-orientation was also almost universally mentioned as a means of effectively and efficiently dealing with people and handling the many aspects of management. Imagination and aggressiveness in devising programs, handling staff problems, and developing improved relations with all outside groups were widely cited as important. Humility and "control of temper" are considered important also in contending with the frustrations of plans and goals.

But what might an administrator do that would qualify as unethical or unprofessional? On this point administrators were quite unclear. While an administrator should be businesslike in many ways, he should not be imitative of businessmen to the point of denying his role as an educator, as a promoter of new ideas through the selection and promotion of books. As such, censorship and generally not adhering to professional "ideals" is considered unprofessional. Conceiving of anything more specifically "unprofessional" seems to be problematic: only one administrator cited relations with trustees and the government, declaring that the unprofessional librarian is one who is not alert to their attitudes towards the library and properly responsive to these attitudes. Three respondents felt that too many such administrators find the library a refuge for a quiet genteel life at the expense of a stagnant and highly inadequate library program.

The question of sanctions was almost inconceivable to the majority of administrators -- several felt that any librarian's unethical or unprofessional conduct would be sanctioned by the local board of trustees! Others felt that the profession should take some punitive action, such as disqualifying the librarian from further practice. All felt that the application of any sanction by the American Library Association or any professional organization was totally unfeasible then and not too likely for the future!

Relationships with the Public

Not surprisingly, only one of the interviewees had any kind of scheduled responsibility for public service work, such as reference or circulation desk duties. The majority have little contact of any kind with library patrons, although all "leave their doors open" to the public. Most complaints as well as requests are handled by someone at the lower or intermediate staff level. All three of the women administrators felt that they should be in contact with the public more frequently and tried

to establish more time for meeting patrons. None of the men felt at all chagrined at their infrequent patron contacts and, indeed, most felt that it simply was not "their job" to be involved in public service of this sort, especially as it was likely to be at the expense of the special tasks constituting the true duties of the administrator. It is quite clear that women administrators generally missed the affect inherent in personal patron service, while men found most satisfaction in their administrative level interpersonal and task relationships.

The members of the panel ranged widely in the number and kind of relationships they have in their respective communities. They were all expected by their boards and by community groups to participate in some community organizations. Nearly all the men were not only expected to join Rotary International and similar civic groups, but were often strongly pressured by board members to participate actively. The Chamber of Commerce also ranked high for a few of the men. The women administrators were expected to join "cultural organizations" or to support their activities through publicity in the library. The men, too, were often invited to support such groups, but tended to spend more time with the male civic groups, notably Rotary Club, an organization of very high rank which does not allow participation by women. Half of the interviewees have some general or special educational program for the community. The development of such organizations or programs was by no means universal; some communities had very active study committees while others had none, but the apparent tendency was for such groups to invite head librarians to participate when such groups were formed. This and other evidence suggests that the librarian is perceived by the community as an educator.

The patrons of the libraries in the study were primarily middle-income, well-educated, white collar people. However, lower-class use of the library was reported as increasing steadily in many communities. While some of the increased use on the part of the less well-educated was accounted for by whites, the majority of the new clientele consisted of younger Negroes anxious to improve their life chances. Lower-class readers, secondly, tended to be more serious readers, in that they used the library for additional learning rather than recreational reading, the administrators felt. One administrator expected that the library clientele will be predominantly lower-class -- white and Negro -- in the not too distant future, but no other interviewees shared this expectation.

Of the various functions of the library, the public approved most the general reference services and the special attention given to pre-school and school children. Adults appreciated greatly the service given to their children, and young people were heavy users of the library in all communities, but they were also appreciative of the special reference service in the four or five libraries that had been able to build up the staff and collections to provide such service. The public, however, failed seriously in the eyes of the administrators to understand many very important functions of the library. Special historical materials, "serious" modern literature, and even bookmobiles were cited as instances. Special programs, such as the Great Books programs, varied widely in their appeal, meeting with great success in one community and with next to no appreciation in another. Only five of the libraries ventured to offer such programs with any regularity, partly because of public indifference and partly because of insufficient library staff and funds, or interest on the part of the staff.

According to the interviewees, the majority of the libraries were considered by patrons primarily as educational rather than recreational in nature, but this view is quite recent in many communities where the emphasis has been on using the library for recreational reading. The increased interest in "serious" reading and "research" in recent years and the "upgrading" of library collections have presumably led to this basic change in the public view toward the library. Nonetheless, librarians feared that many segments of the public will never consider the library as primarily an educational institution, but continue to expect of it casual reading and other materials essentially for personal entertainment. Boards and government officials generally consider the library as being primarily educational in nature, but there was no firm or clear consensus on the matter. Many elected officials view the library primarily as a dignified recreational outlet even in communities whose library public takes the library more seriously.

In spite of the modest proportion of the general population that uses the public library and this clientele's uncertain appreciation of the library's functions in ideal professional library terms, there was no doubt among the administrators that the community feels very strongly positive about the library. Not one felt that the library would close its doors except as the result of some extraordinary disaster. Closing the library would cause a "major catastrophe", would raise a "fantastic howl" in the community, and it would be restored at once -- probably stronger than it had been. The library public

is small but would presumably be very vocal and powerful under the pressure of such a situation.

The strongest supporters of the library may or may not be formally organized. In some communities the library's "best friends" are families or housewives. In others, the trustees are perhaps the only strong "friends". However, in the majority of cases other organized groups such as the Rotary Club, the American Association of University Women, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Junior League, Hadassah Society, the Parent-Teachers Association and the League of Women Voters, in addition to formally organized Friends of the Library groups, demonstrate regular and strong support of the library. Many of the members of these groups (or their wives) are politically influential, and are consequently very helpful in establishing a base of communication and influence for the librarian and the library.

In only one community is there any organized opposition to the library, except perhaps in isolated and infrequent instances. This does not mean that the library and the librarian were free of threatened hostility or opposition, for the potential was felt by many administrators, if not all. One librarian has endured for years the regular and highly organized harassment from a John Birch Society chapter, including television and radio broadcasts attacking the library and the librarian. Although the librarian has been able to respond with affect (the attacks were usually based on false and falsified information), the strength and determination of this organization is such that the attacks continue. While other librarians have had no experience of this order, they expected that it could happen and were at least mildly apprehensive about the possibility.

The major source of opposition stems from a general public apathy toward the library, leaving it vulnerable to attacks from ad hoc groups of property owners who organize temporarily to oppose increased taxation or bond issues that would benefit the library. The opposition is not against the library per se but rather against paying higher taxes for nearly all local public improvements. When proposals for new buildings and similar improvements for the library arise, the lines of support and opposition are often mixed. While many of the middle and upper-middle class leaders of the community tend to support the library -- especially the professional and managerial occupational groups who are not usually large property-owners -- some of the ordinarily militant "right wing" leaders may be counted on to support the library, too.

This was accounted for in at least two communities by the fact that the library may be seen as a very positive asset to the community in attracting new business and industry, especially those heavily manned by white-collar workers who are expected to look for cultural advantages, including good library service, in the community. In one of the larger communities the commerce executive responsible for guiding industrial prospects around the city invariably included the library as a prominent part of the itinerary, and he regularly commented to the librarian that this was one of the prize assets in promoting the community as a new site for such prospects. In smaller communities the advantage of the library was not so clearly understood. One administrator reported that the city manager had expressed puzzlement as to why his prospective business leaders inquired about the library and asked to see it! The library in this community was one of the most poorly supported in the state.

The support of labor unions was not of any great importance. Union membership and strength are very modest in the state, and while several local labor leaders are known to support the library and to encourage its use, their influence is not nearly as marked as the strength of the professional and business leaders. Library administrators have rarely sought out labor union leaders for their support and seem generally unaware of the possibility of support from this quarter.

Administrators have felt free to solicit support from individuals and organizations and to take advantage of any situation that will afford an opportunity to publicize the services as well as the needs of the library. However, they have been rather selective in these attentions; the boards and the administrators both felt that any exposure of the library to the public is good but they tended to restrict themselves to meetings with middle-class civic organizations, hobby and fraternal or social groups, and the few educational groups in their communities. No administrator has felt that it has been necessary or appropriate to air any problems or grievances with the public through the news media or with their colleagues in the professional literature, but they felt that they were free to do so. The boards might not welcome this kind of publicity, and the interviewees would all be very uncomfortable in protesting publicly about any problems of the library, but they did assert that it is incumbent on a professional librarian to speak out against any infringements, especially where censorship is concerned.

Boards and administrators both felt a great need and work quite strongly to keep in regular contact with

many organizations, especially the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club and similar groups. Very rarely, however, has anything controversial arisen and administrators have refrained generally from introducing controversy, however free they claimed to feel to do so. It was felt that only in very recent years has the need or opportunity arisen for public airing of many library problems. The location of new library facilities, for instance, is quite often a point of contention in the community. Administrators increasingly find themselves in the position of strongly endorsing the plan that seems best to them and increasingly attacking other plans. Presentation of arguments for a particular plan, as well as arguments opposing other plans, may be made at civic group meetings and before government officials. Such contests are given detailed coverage in the press, but tend to be resolved in the semi-public forums of officials and civic organizational meetings.

Relationships with the Profession

Administrators are sensitive enough to the profession's norms to resent intrusion on book selection and other professionally delineated functions, but their involvement in general professional affairs ranged widely. A bare majority held that its first identification or allegiance is with public librarianship rather than librarianship in general. Those with the broader sense of affiliation have had some kind of experience as academic librarians previous to their present work. All reported that the longer they acted as public librarians the closer they felt to this particular branch of the occupation. Relationships with other library executives in similar positions was quite important as a source of ideas for new buildings and programs and of moral support. Most such relationships were with individuals within the state or region, but some were with persons at quite distant points and required regular correspondence as well as reliance on national professional meetings. Professional association membership and meetings were considered by five to be valuable and by others to range from "secondary importance" to "worthless". Journals in the field were read widely and used as sources for new ideas and maintaining a sense of identification with the profession. By and large personal communication with other librarians, including subordinates, was considered more valuable than the formal papers and addresses of associational meetings and most professional literature. Administrators were about evenly divided in being indifferent to participation in professional associations and being quite dependent on and active in such associations.

Many administrators felt that their library education was of extraordinary and lasting benefit in their career

in that it provided both the knowledge base for their various tasks and the motivation to carry them out. The State Library and the variety of "workshops" devoted to particular library operations were also considered helpful.

Administrators felt almost unanimously that loyalty to the profession was second in importance to loyalty to the community, to the particular libraries that they manage. Such sentiments were quite mixed, for many felt that one's primary loyalty should be to the profession. However, the profession was often seen as "too idealistic" (the "main thing is to build a strong local library, and compromises on such things as censorship are necessary to do it") and as, "far away like the federal government". Professional norms were considered very important -- but as guidelines and as flexible "rules of thumb". The local community was generally viewed as an employer whose payment for services naturally commands first attention. Professional norms were useful to cite in conflicts or situations that pressure the librarian to compromise his professional norms excessively, but "there's no sense in butting your head against a stone wall" in contesting local pressures when they conflict with professional norms. One articulate respondent said, "One gets valor from the profession, as one gets discretion from the community. Discretion is the better part of valor!"

Administrators do nevertheless support with great fervor certain crucial policies and standards of the profession that do not meet with favor in many communities. For instance, not only was there no real reservation among administrators about the desirability of multi-unit library systems in spite of considerable local opposition, but there was also reported a great deal of effort already expended in developing and expanding existing systems. Some felt that special efforts must be made to retain the "local touch" in county-wide or multi-county systems, but all felt the need for pooling materials and human resources within the framework of sizeable administrative library units.

Only one county in the study contains two large cities, and this county, because of the inability of governmental officials to determine which city should serve as the central library agency, does not have a unified system of service. The head librarians of the two city libraries are quite incompatible personally, and the governing officials as well as the library boards are mutually distrustful, each feeling that the other will profit at its expense. All of the other cities are central units in trade areas, and the tendency to develop

various commercial and financial services on an area basis is quite pronounced. Similar development of public services has been considerably slower.

In many counties there is great jealousy over the proportion of payment and responsibility that should accrue to the county and its central city. City governments tend to be pleased with the prospect of turning over the responsibility for operating and financing the library to the county government. Many groups in some cities, including some government officials as well as trustee boards, are quite proud and possessive of their city libraries and are reluctant to give up any autonomy to the county. Similar sentiments are held when plans for multi-county units are proposed. Allocation of federal and state funds is often predicated on membership in a system, but the local officials of at least one large city library are sufficiently hostile to such required standards, to the "strings" they see attached, that they prefer to maintain a poor but locally independent institution.

The acceptance of the librarian's personal involvement in and commitment to the profession is viewed with greater similarity by administrators and local officials as well as boards. All parties feel that the head librarian has some obligation to engage in some kind of activity outside of his regular position, such as consulting, research, or teaching. Only one administrator reported that his board feels that he may be neglecting his job by engaging in such activities, and nearly all administrators felt themselves that consulting, teaching, and research would facilitate their work rather than interfere with it. However, the actual practices of administrators vary greatly. One is a nationally established building consultant with sixty-five clients in twenty states to his record as well as several current cases. Another has taught several summers at a local college and has completed two major literary manuscripts. Except for rare consulting jobs for nearby local libraries, most of the other administrators have had little such experience. Two have not had any involvement in depth in any such activities. Library boards and city officials approve highly of the publicity that attends these activities, even if it takes some time away from managing the library.

Librarians often involve themselves in local organizations that do not so clearly exploit their special professional talents as do teaching, consulting and research. They feel that in most instances the most appropriately trained member of the staff should participate in community projects. Further, some communities have

had little activity that invites or requires the special talents of the head librarian, and some administrators felt that they should restrict their activities to those where they could most effectively use their knowledge and skills as librarians in order to restrict the possibility of becoming involved in "politics". The three administrators most active in their communities did not share this degree of aversion to "political involvement" and have tended to take on tasks that have any slight relevance to the library to the end of offering a wide range of service to the community and simultaneously "making friends" for the library.

Relationships with the Board of Trustees and Local Government

The professional problems, overt behavior, and attitudes of the library director are in large part influenced by his relationships with his board of trustees and the government officials in his community. The boards are composed predominantly of white business and professional men. High school teachers, active and retired, and dentists are commonly members, and wives of white-collar business and professional men constitute a minority membership. There is often one Negro middle-class member, also. The board plays a very important part in most respects if only because it is the legal agency interposed between the director and the government and community. Boards were said to have only control over "very broad policy matters", but definition of "policy" as contrasted with "administration" varied quite widely among administrators. The crucial determinant, according to the respondents, was not the legally prescribed duties of the board but the willingness and ability of the board to participate in any way and on any level in library affairs. The board has the authority to hire personnel in one of the larger systems, but actually refuses to concern itself at all with such matters, leaving them to the discretion of the librarian who consults with the county manager for approval. In the majority of cases the board does discuss and act on departmental head appointments as well as the appointment of the director. Its action on the middle management posts is nearly always purely perfunctory. The board, however, is often open as a court of appeal for discharged staff members. Increasingly, the personnel departments of the city or county play a more important role in the selection of personnel than does the board. However, the jurisdiction of boards is not everywhere clear in this respect as in others. Boards often are autonomous themselves, although governing a tax-supported agency. Rivalry between boards and local governments, especially where there is a strong city or county manager, is quite common.

One director readily asserted that his board was concerned strictly with policy matters, then offered for examination a manual issued by the board. This document listed in great detail the proper procedure and behavior for staff members and included a demerit system for infringement of the regulations. Other directors felt that this was a clear violation of the administrative responsibility of the librarian, but they occasionally reported similar but less extensive intrusions. The hours that the library will be open to the public, the use of special meeting rooms, and the handling of special "censorship" problems are among them. The especially sensitive area of book selection is apparently not a major problem. No board participates in the selection of books, most are in general agreement in policy with the permissive and anti-censoring standard of the library profession. Boards do occasionally consider complaints from patrons concerning an individual title, but they serve almost universally as a supportive force for the librarian: if the director insists that the book should be retained the board will second his action. This stratagem is considered valuable by many directors -- it serves to emphasize to the board the need for maintaining a free and open selection policy and to demonstrate to the public that such a policy has the approval of the trustees as well as the librarian.

Most directors did not feel that the boards interfere in any undesirable way in the administration of the library. In approximately half the cases boards were considered simply too apathetic to be considered a danger in defining the jurisdiction of the library or the librarian! The board says to one director, "You are the professional, you tell us," and the director finds this gratifying and at the same time he wishes that the board would become more involved in planning and promoting. Another director felt that his board is "ignorant", without real interest in the library, and that "it is difficult if not impossible to educate grown men." That appointments to boards are political was a source of great chagrin to him and was generally disapproved by other directors, but most directors felt that the "good" librarian must and will educate his board and somehow manage to get them involved as they should be. Success is not so striking as their sentiment; those libraries with "active" and "strong" boards usually have only a portion of their trustees intelligently and consistently committed to their tasks. Nonetheless, even partial involvement was considered very beneficial for both general policy planning and assistance in technical administrative problems. Even those members who are apathetic were usually described as cordial and sympathetic and even well-informed about the needs and objectives of public librarianship.

Although open hostility is rare between director and board or between director and the local government, potential conflicts are common, especially in the larger cities and where the director is continually pushing for improvements. One of the most aggressive and successful librarians said, "An administrator should keep his bags packed," in the event there is any disagreement as to "who should run what." Head librarians felt that they were more likely to have more problems with governing officials than with their boards. City managers usually feel that the board is officious and unnecessary and want to deal directly with the librarian; "active" boards may oppose this, leaving the librarian caught between the two. The librarian may want to use the board for political and technical support when he feels that the governing authorities are not giving the library either its due share of financial support or attention. Two directors reported that their city managers "play politics" rather than a disinterested professional role. The board of trustees serves as a buffer and a means of commanding the attention of city hall in these cases. With an apathetic board and sympathetic government the librarian may be well-off, but still find himself laboring very heavily with city aldermen or county commissioners who ultimately control the budget or other important factors. Usually the director can count on nominal support from his board in his relationships with both elected and administrative officials. Usually he can also count on some city or county departments for assistance with specific problems.

In most communities the city or county manager may represent the library and plead for it before the elected body; in less than half of them, however, does the manager alone appear at any such formal hearings. The librarian almost invariably has the opportunity to make a case for his budget, and about half the directors are accompanied by a trustee member or the chairman and carry the endorsement of the chief governmental executive as well. The majority of elected aldermen and commissioners serve only two-year terms, and the rapid turnover makes it problematic for the library executive to anticipate their attitudes towards the library. Elected officials are extremely varied in their appreciation of the public library. Most know little about it and care little; they are willing to accept requests for moderate budgetary increases, for instance, without offering serious opposition. Extensive increases or changes in structure may meet with considerable opposition and ignorance of the issues. The lack of continuity among these groups is not helpful; librarians like other agency heads find themselves repeating the same message to different elective bodies. Elected officials are, however, more informed about and

interested in library affairs in larger communities and in those communities where it has been demonstrated to them that improvements such as bookmobiles and regional affiliations of librarians are beneficial. The changes in attitudes among elected groups come slower than among professional managers in government, and the establishing of contact with them is more difficult for librarians than it is with managers. Being politically oriented, however, does make elected officials sensitive to demands or needs of constituents. Aldermen and commissioners may fail to see the value of a general enlargement of services but are quick to appreciate the "need" (and personal political reward) for establishing a new library branch in their individual districts. Consequently, services sometimes develop slowly and erratically, dependent on the political judgment of elected representatives. Nonetheless, many if not all directors felt that this is at least a source of promise for library development, piecemeal as it may be. The assumption was that if enough aldermen or commissioners were acquisitive for their constituents there would be hope for a coordinated and comprehensive community program.

The fear of total indifference to the library is far greater, and the fear of competing city-county elected groups presents ever more serious consequences. The decision as to whether the city or the county should have primary responsibility for library service plagues at least three major communities, leaving the libraries presently in very poor financial and political circumstances. On the positive side, no director reported any serious interference with the operation of the library, or any intrusion into proper professional administration. Two of the directors are expected by their boards to carry out what are generally considered non-professional duties, but given a generally very modest level of support and considerable apathy, most boards do not expect behavior of their directors that violate their sense of professional integrity. In fact, as one head librarian put it, "The board often doesn't know what to expect of the librarian -- it has to be told!" Further, most directors felt that when particular controversies do arise between board and director it is because there has been inadequate communication of all the variables involved in the issue and that explanation and discussion leads quite readily to a resolution of such problems.

In all but one instance boards were reported as being enthusiastic about increasing the use of the library by working-class or lower-class members of the community, and they were pleased with the results of their libraries in broadening the base of use in this manner. However, it is rare that a board shows any active interest by

providing special counsel or other efforts to so promote the library. Further, it is quite certain that boards generally do not appreciate the need for special kinds of appeals necessary to bring in lower-class patrons to what is essentially a middle-class institution. Government officials are not particularly concerned about getting more patrons. They are often faced with the special problems of tactics and strategies necessary to provide any great improvement in services, such improvements usually being dependent on a bond referendum or special tax supplement election. The library competes with other local agencies in such fund drives, and the city manager and his staff necessarily must coordinate all the appeals to maximize their chances for success.

Members of library boards are not themselves heavy users of the library, nor are government officials and legislators. In most communities one or two of the trustees do use the library often and for serious purposes. In three cities the city manager himself is a heavy user of the library, relying on it for considerable assistance in his work. Two library directors issue a list of books and periodicals with annotations for use by local government, and these are used extensively by many agency heads. One city manager regularly documents his reports and requests to the city councilmen and county commissioners by reference to the library bibliography. The families of city councilmen and county commissioners are very often library patrons, but few elected officials themselves can be so counted.

A common problem in public library board and director relationships is interpreting library use in quantitative terms such as circulation figures, especially where the board members are not themselves heavy users of the library. A bare majority of the directors found that their boards "just love circulation statistics", as one reported. The other boards either have only a moderate interest in figures or think more strongly of "qualitative" measures such as the introduction of new programs, the development of new branches or special collections. Businessmen members of boards have remarked to their directors that they do not expect regular increases in any phase of library service any more than they do in their businesses. Government groups generally do not seem much affected one way or another by statistical reports -- they generally seem either not to understand or not to be interested in them. Interpreting such reports is only a minor instance of the general and major problem of the librarian in satisfying his superiors that he is doing his job well and in the even more difficult and important task of obtaining their support for his programs.

The most crucial aspect of his work is focused on his strategies in presenting arguments for the library budget. Although the board is supposed to participate in the planning and preparation of the budget, typically this work is done by the librarian who then presents the budget to the board. The budget is usually conservative in its requests and is usually approved by the board with only minor modifications. Most directors maintain some kind of friendly contact with financial and political officials in addition to the more sympathetic board members with a view to exploiting any possible opening for submitting and obtaining approval for an increased budget. In only one community is this consistently precluded: the budget is prepared by the librarian in conjunction with her very conservative financial chairman, and the board virtually forbids her developing informal discussions with anyone outside the board.

Consulting with a city or county manager and financial officer before bringing the budget to the board serves to provide a more realistic and informed background for financial planning and at the same time places the librarian in a more powerful position with his board in the event that the board may feel that the budget is too large or otherwise not likely to be approved by the government. As one librarian put it, "The librarian can't leave the budget up to the board. He's incompetent if he does. He should go to anyone (of influence) who can help." When the budget is considered by the city council or county commissioners the librarian usually has the opportunity to appear in its behalf. The board alone represents the library at such hearings in only one community; some member of the board accompanies the librarian in many cases, but very often there is no need for any representation, for the legislative body may be already quite committed to passage of the budget, knowing that it has been approved by the librarian, the board, and the executive branch of the local government. Further, the support of organized "friends of the library" groups may influence legislative decisions. Head librarians generally do not include such groups in their political maneuvering as they are not always available. One eager librarian, however, does include a "friend" even at his trustee board meetings. In addition, many librarians lay the groundwork for approval by approaching councilmen or commissioners informally long before the budget hearings. While outright "hostile" commissioners are not readily swayed, many others are willing to listen to reasonable pleading. Nearly all directors "politic" in this fashion in addition to sounding out the sympathies -- and enlisting them -- of the executive branch officials. As one very forthright librarian said, "It's my place to politic for money rather than leave it up to the board. . . .

Boards may talk aggressively in meetings but fail to follow through in city hall."

By and large the male directors pursue this course of action vigorously and the female directors find themselves handicapped. Similarly, in budget hearings men "will be treated rough and ready but in a friendly way," while women may be shown such courtesy that serious consideration of their requests is sharply precluded. Women are quite consistently discouraged from "wheeling and dealing" in the same fashion that male administrators practice. In one dramatic case, a newly appointed male director approached the chairman of the county commissioners in developing plans for the budget -- no one had pled the case of the library in years, and the chairman was extremely surprised and initially very negative. After a lengthy discussion of the library's needs the chairman gave his blessing and pushed through the librarian's requests. In future years he could be counted on to support the library strongly, so convinced did he become of the worth of this agency. Another administrator personally convinced a state legislator to have a special state tax, that was to be distributed to individual counties, earmarked for library use. In such instances, the respect for the librarian himself is very influential in budgetary decisions.

Where the board is strongly influential in the community and the library has other allies, the councilmen and commissioners are likely to approve the library budget without the intercession of the librarian: such cases are especially important where the library head is a woman or the librarian is not able to enlist the support of executive officials. When there is a conflict between two groups on the board or in the legislative body concerning a library matter, librarians felt generally that they should take a positive stand. For instance, when presenting the need for an improved salary schedule, most librarians felt that they should not simply mediate between the trustees or legislators who support and those who oppose the raises, but should actively voice their opinion in the matter as well as present evidence about it. Such feelings are by no means unanimous, however. There is a strong minority opinion that the board should share in the details of the budget planning, that it should share this responsibility rather than be relegated to a "rubber-stamp role", and that the librarian should not bypass the board in any step of the budgetary process. Further, a very few felt that the board should take the initiative in defending salary raises before the legislative body, and that the librarian must not presume on this responsibility even if the board were to allow it.

The library director's conception of his responsibility to the board and the proper role for him to take in terms of initiating action for the board is revealed in other ways as well. One of the most fundamental indicators of this is his ability or willingness to influence the appointment of members to the board of trustees. Nearly all of the directors have some voice in the appointment of trustees; three of them have a very strong voice and almost invariably find their nominees appointed. Feelings about this are mixed; many are uncomfortable in deciding the composition of a group that has the power to hire and fire the director. One director keeps her appointive influence secret and another feels much better off not having such power. Further, the fact that most such appointments are political rewards to local citizens suggests to many directors that they are involved in politics in an unseemly fashion. Others felt that it is only realistic to exploit the opportunity and happily take advantage of the opportunity to so engage in politics. Such appointments are usually screened by the city or county manager or the mayor and passed on by the county commissioners or city council.

The existing board also has influence in deciding its own make-up; the nominations of the librarian are often made in consultation with one or more of the more active and influential board members. Consequently many boards are virtually self-perpetuating or at least restricted to quite similar social and personality types. Appointments are often too long, nearly all directors felt, and too many members are regularly re-appointed. A few trustees have served as long as thirty years. However, some of those with long tenure are greatly favored by the directors if they have the experience and willingness to continue effectively.

Although the funds available to libraries are substantially fixed by special tax law, there is a certain amount of competition with other public agencies for financial support. No one agency or type of agency, including the public school system, was felt to be generally more competitive for attention than others. Bond referendums and special tax supplements for school, hospital, road-paving improvements, and airport construction do, however, prove highly competitive and generally receive higher rankings than libraries. The library is widely regarded as an independent agency and only rarely suffers from being associated with the school system in the government. While the library's distinctive contribution is respected and there is little ill-will towards it, other community needs are given more serious and consistent attention. Library directors support school improvements, some of them are very active in bond drives,

albeit realizing that at least in the short-run they are aiding a serious competitor for public money. In addition to satisfying a personal desire to work for community development in supporting other agencies, librarians also gain some esteem by publicly participating in these projects.

Providing services to groups as contrasted with individuals and with particular attention to special collections and services for strategically placed or very needy groups is very mixed. Librarians were overwhelmingly in favor of directing their attention to group services, feeling that it is "cheaper", "more efficient", "you reach more people this way." There was considerable misgiving, on the other hand, that this policy is really rewarding only if it results in greater numbers of individuals using the library for individual as well as group purposes. Reading improvement programs conducted through the YWCA and other organizations and preparing reading lists for discussion in all kinds of organizations were seen as being valuable not only for their primary purpose but also very important, perhaps more so, for bringing new patrons to the library as regular users. About one-third of the libraries provide extensive group services while another third does very little because there has been little response. There is considerable favor gained for the library, even from non-users, in devoting special attention to the physically handicapped or others with reading problems. But even greater favor accrues to the library, at least from influential groups, in special services given to business and professional people. Several librarians are only now beginning to develop such services and collections for industry and business, but nearly all are much interested in this work and have or are presently acquiring the interest and participation of business organizations in its planning and development.

No library charges any special fee and no librarian expected to do so, although the Chamber of Commerce in one town is proposing to pay an annual stipend for certain services. No one has experienced or anticipates any antagonism in the community for giving special attention in the business sector. On the contrary, such services are universally perceived as a means of acquiring powerful friends for the library as well as providing needed services. That the focus of the limited facilities of the library on this group may preclude attention to other community needs is of little or no worry to the panel. Rather, they feel that the increased support of the business community will lead to a general increase of library finances, permitting advances on other problems.

The majority of library directors are not involved with other professional groups or other civic groups, although they do appreciate the advantages that might be gained if they were. Three of the male directors are extremely active, frequently assuming leadership or executive roles in various community activities aimed at urban planning, education, welfare, industrial development and similar goals, even in instances where the library is not directly concerned. None of the female directors are but nominally active in such work. However, it is far more common for directors, male and female, to have "social" friends who are powerful or close to the powerful in the community. All directors felt that such relationships should be cultivated, as long as they arise "naturally". That is, the librarian should not unduly seek out important members of the community to establish friendships. And many claimed that it is essential to avoid direct and open involvement in "politics", especially political campaigns, when one has political friends. One of the most respected members of the panel has few such social contacts, feels that he doesn't need them, but that they are definitely a strong asset in many instances. Caution, the fear of compromising the library -- "you can't say 'no' to a friend" -- characterizes many of these relationships. The value of contacts is emphasized by those who do count city councilmen or county commissioners as their friends.

The panel was asked to evaluate the action of a large metropolitan public library director who, when faced with a serious budget reduction, had reduced the public services drastically to demonstrate what would happen if the library failed to receive more financial support. As a result of his action there was strong reaction in the community with great pressure on the city council, and the library was given more money. While such action visibly struck many respondents as drastic and as a "last resort", they all supported it. A few had even been involved in similar situations and declared that it was the only recourse open and had positive results for the library. They all felt that the board should support such action if only to make it effective but they were less certain that the librarian rather than the board might appropriately initiate such a move. A minority felt that the librarian should be the initiator and should insist that the board give its approval. Generally it was felt that the library must be in quite dire circumstances before any reduction of services should be considered, but when faced with the need, that the librarian should be resolute in insisting on proper support or resign his position.

That similar tactics might be used to demonstrate the need for increased aid rather than as a "protest" against reduced aid was not considered wise or even feasible. Typically, one librarian reported that in similar circumstances her library had at one time temporarily reduced its hours of opening, but at the least busy time. When it was suggested that closing at the "busiest time" might have been "more demonstrative", she became quite upset and insisted that the more conservative tactic had provoked "adequate" public reaction. This library, like the others, is still "inadequate" by the modest standards of the American Library Association.

In comparing the relative degree of understanding of library problems between trustee boards and government officials, most head librarians felt that their boards are superior if only due to the boards' necessary contact with the persistent issues, procedures and problems of the library. Only a couple of directors felt that they have "good" boards, and all wanted to see a great deal of improvement of board attitudes and participation. For the women directors the board is clearly perceived as a buffer and as an interpreter. At least one definite instance of hostility toward the library on the part of the city manager is due to his viewing the board as an interfering body that should be abolished. The librarian felt that the board is essential to him to preserve the library. The sentiments about boards' effectiveness are not necessarily congruent with the feelings about their "understanding". Common complaints pointed to the excessive tenure, the practice of reappointment, and the use of trustee appointments as a political reward.

Further, boards could presumably be improved if the members were different in other respects -- if there were more men rather than women, and if they were mostly businessmen and professionals. "Give me a businessman every time. . . you can talk to a businessman. . . they're far better than the 'do-gooders', the women with nothing but ideals." Three of the most active of the male directors felt strongly that boards should be abolished because they are not effective. These men felt that the librarian should be a departmental head like other agency heads. In contrast with those who feel that the board is needed to "express public needs" even if the government is "clean" they claimed that they do not need the board as an adviser or buffer. They can discover public opinion directly through various community groups better than by sounding out the board. Further, "if county commissioners play dirty politics with the library, the librarian should play the same game -- get groups around the city and county to work on his behalf." Another felt that modern professional city management has made the board outmoded

and a handicap to the library. As an agency head directly responsible to the government without a trustee board the librarian will get the attention the board cannot or will not get. On the other hand, one administrator pointed out that boards as lay people can communicate better with elected officials who act as a lay body and who still tend to distrust "experts" and professionals, whatever their agency affiliation.

In comparing the lot of their own libraries with those of the United States in general most directors felt that they are about as well off. The lack of funds and of an adequate and well-qualified staff are universal problems, and it is felt that improvements will continually be made in these respects as well as in communication with community leaders. The number and size of tasks of libraries and librarians dismays many who see no relief for this in the near future, and the shortcomings of colleagues "who lose sight of library goals in the face of overwhelming tasks" is also a source of concern.

In addition to looking to the profession to provide future assistance in coping with their problems, the majority of directors considered the profession presently far stronger in its influence on the standards and policies of library operations than purely local expectations and standards. In two communities where the local influence is felt to outweigh that of the profession, two recently appointed directors asserted that the situation is changing rapidly and that the proper professional norms will prevail over the local in the very near future. By professional standards and policies, however, some librarians considered the state library and library associations as the prime source rather than the American Library Association and similar national associations. The librarian most deprived of power and of funds considered the local influences to be far stronger on the library than any other, although she does "keep state standards in mind" with hope for improved circumstances. Further, there is some assumption that professional goals and guidelines are not really in conflict with local board and governmental standards, but that local groups are not convinced of the need or the desirability of meeting professional standards "at this time".

Directors are uneasy and somewhat uncertain about the specific kind of role they should take when the professional norms they wish to adhere to are opposed by their boards or city government. Given that boards must be accepted as superordinate in accordance with the law, most administrators felt "morally bound to take the position of the board," but held that they should

persistently inform their boards of the library's needs and agitate for action to meet them. If opposition continues the librarian should quit.

The degree of compromise and the proper duration for "educating" the board are not at all clearly defined. "The obligation to the board is paramount," but the librarian should "lay down the law" to his board. He "must guard against censorship" and other serious intrusions on professional norms and "try to keep the board busy with things in order to avoid potential conflict," or leave his position if he is continually over-ridden. All felt that the personal qualities of the head librarian are extremely important in resolving local opposition to professional norms. A man can be aggressive and will work out problems with boards and officials, sums up the sentiments of the aggressive executives.

The more passive executives had fewer qualms about having a superior jurisdiction in the form of the board and felt that they "use" the board in many ways. "Administration is lonely. . . . I'm not an ideal administrator. . . . I don't read books about administration. . . . I just grew into this job; I feel more like a librarian than an administrator" were remarks made by those who come more readily to terms with their boards and with serious compromises of professional standards. This smaller group is not apt to resign under any but the most severe conditions, if then, and has relatively weaker internalization of many professional norms. "Most modern literature is trash anyway, so I don't worry about censorship," was characteristic response from this minority group.

In most cases directors felt that they were not certain what would happen if they became involved in a controversy -- typically, they would "feel like I was in hot water, but not sure I would be!" It is not always possible for directors to predict the reactions of boards and government officials to controversy. One director who had suffered for years with a policy of racial segregation that had been enacted by his board, came to a meeting one night and with no warning demanded that the library be de-segregated, and found to his surprise no opposition at all: the library was immediately de-segregated.

Those with strong convictions about their professional obligations and role felt that they need to work with full understanding of changing community conditions and to meet the changing needs that follow, and that the librarian must be in a strong position to argue his

case for adapting the library to such changes. His strength is based on his ability to document the needs and his ability to acquire allies on the board and elsewhere in the community. With such strength he will be able to bring the library into its professionally defined role in the community.

References

1. Elizabeth Pace, County Salaries in North Carolina (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, 1966), pp. 52-54.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

At the beginning of this study it was assumed that stress in the role of the library executive arises from the conflict between the differential values and norms of his profession and those prevailing in the governmental bureaucracy of which the library is a part. The major professional norms define the librarian's role as a promoter of his organization's educational services. More specifically, the administrator is expected to enlist support for programs and services which he must initiate. Such programs must be of a high quality and extend to as many people in the community as possible. Special services to potential influentials such as business and government leaders are urged as are vigorous and informed public relations. Freedom from censorship and from interference in professional management is expected.

The evidence from our analysis in the foregoing chapters indicates that the library administrator operates under conditions that severely limit the effectiveness of his agency and of his own role, and engender pressures and problems in filling the professional role. The most important of these conditions are the tax structure and educational level of the community, the status or "image" of the library and the librarian in the community, and the role of local government.

It is said in the profession that public libraries truly began when public tax support was provided. Entering their second century, public libraries while widely supported are still poorly supported by taxes. The amount of local taxation is inadequate, and the effectiveness of the assistance from state and federal tax funds is still too recent to be firmly evaluated. While state and federal support is largely designed to act as "seed" money to inspire individual communities to increase library appropriations, the burden of local property taxes is so great that the results for the library are still in question. Reliance on philanthropy and special funds from other sources remains necessary but is still too unreliable to provide a sound fiscal basis for library development.

Generally speaking, as the level of education increases there develops a greater need and demand for use of the public library. However, the level of education is still very low in many areas of the country with the consequence that the differences among libraries seem to become greater. Even in those more educationally favored communities there is still a widespread lack of any public appreciation of the special role of the library in modern technological society and for continuing education on all social levels in the terms in which the profession perceives this role. In brief, understanding of the public library is not crystallized clearly or uniformly.

The public image of the library is that it is "good," with considerable reservations about its necessity. The library is considered valuable primarily for women and children. While patronage includes ever larger numbers of students and lower working class members, present use of the library is primarily middle-class, with modest adult patronage and far greater use by women than men. Further, there are misgivings about some real or potential dangers -- in reading generally, and in the public diffusion of radical or immoral ideas from the library specifically. Indeed, the library often becomes the scapegoat in the local community for many moral and political issues.

State and local governmental regulations set up a specific structure within which the librarian must operate. Governmental leaders are more appreciative of the library and of the librarian than the general public, but the extent of this appreciation is considerably less than that required for the level of service expected by the profession and by the library administrator. The library's trustees place the library in an even more ambiguous position: the board tends to be autonomous in its relationship with the local government although its membership is based on political appointments. The board is supposed to act as a buffer between the library and government, providing the library with protection and militant support, but it actually needs to be goaded into action on any issue by the administrator who finds his trustees more apathetic than helpful. The administrator does turn to the board for assistance because this is required by law, because there is nowhere else to turn in many instances, and because the board, in spite of its polite indifference, is more understanding of the library's problems than any other group in the community.

It is questionable that boards, as they are presently constituted, can or do represent the "will of the public" to the administrators. Further, government officials,

elected as well as appointed, do feel that they more nearly represent the community, and are more suited to serve as library authorities.

The library administrator as a purely practical matter must develop relationships with each of these groups and use them to the best advantage of the library. There are few guidelines, for the patterns of relationships have never been clearly studied. What evidence there is suggests that communities with strong and professional city government will find less use for trustees. The library administrator will feel that his trustees may be helpful as advisers, but that by and large he can operate most successfully by working directly with public authorities. However, where the local governmental professionals become involved in politics, the library may suffer -- either because the government managers wish to gain favor with the politicians by reducing expenditures (the library invariably ranks low in budget priority) or because they wish to control the library for personal power. Where the trustees wish to assert their authority they will struggle with such officials, and the library administrator is caught in a difficult contest for power over the library, and must himself develop what power he can.

In sum, as Parsons has pointed out, the librarian does not enjoy a clearly defined "sphere of autonomy" in which he can try to play his professional role. The library is isolated in the community, lacking similar organizations with which it may affiliate, and it is found to be without natural and organized political allies. The administrator is left with considerable uncertainty about the degree of compromise he may make with his professional determination of library needs as contrasted with the public "demand" or lay determination of those needs.

That professional expectations or norms for administrators are important to librarians is shown in both the written avowals of the literature and the interview reports. These expectations, however, are likely at the same time to be excessively demanding, vague and over-general in character, and often non-existent for situations that the administrator finds most problematic. Primarily the administrator is expected to be aggressive and to be an educator. Given the general milieu in which he works -- community apathy, the low status of the library stemming from a general indifference towards learning within the framework of library functions, the legal and financial restrictions placed on library support -- the librarian is bound to ask how can he carry out his role as an aggressive, educational leader?

His role as promoter is hindered at times by members of the governmental bureaucracy and community leaders as well as some patrons. Communities, it seems, want a library administrator to be a promoter, but one of modest demands and conventional intellectual leanings. He should have a polite intellectual bent with a sound head for business; this is the consensus of the panel and a logical deduction from the prescriptive writings on administration. A radical or unduly innovative intellectual (educator) is out of place in American communities which lack an intellectual elite or general public respect for such elitism. Innovation in the promotion of conventional albeit wide-ranging library materials and their proper housing fortunately is quite within the normative acceptance of most communities. And it is here that the administrator turns his attention.

The profession clearly esteems those administrators who produce new and improved buildings, increased services and collections. Close inspection of the quality of those collections and of the personal educational role of the library administrator is not a problem.

In any event his professional norms and sanctions are of minimal help. The librarian must try to avoid legal entanglements and at the same time promote his organization. Where there is no threat of legal sanction he feels free to negotiate openly with officials other than trustees. Invariably the pressures from local groups, trustees, governmental and political groups are stronger than those of the profession, and the administrator accordingly takes most of his cues from local folkways. In spite of physical isolation, the administrators' ties with the profession are maintained through professional meetings, correspondence, and journals. While they feel their first loyalty should be to the profession, public librarians actually tend to feel stronger ties to the local community, just as they experience greater local pressures.

Of the few definite professional goals is the emphasis on the quality of service as opposed to the quantity of service. Although administrators claim to adhere to this important goal unreservedly, they often fall short. For although the panel protested to a man that they were not "quantitatively" oriented as the literature predicts, their major analyses of most library operations can be so characterized.

Another kind of behavior felt by the profession to be a shortcoming is the failure of many library administrators to grasp opportunities for furthering their professional and organizational roles because they fear

political involvement. This fear inhibits action in community affairs which could result in relationships favorable to the librarian and his organization. This requires a delicate balance of involvement with a more or less constant threat of being accused of political partisanship. Many administrators shirk fulfillment of professional goals because of their reluctance to expose themselves to the local power structure in intimidating situations.

Library administrators hold that their mission is educational, but that it requires a businesslike approach coupled with a liking for people as well as books. They feel uneasy about colleagues who are too quiet and passive, especially about censorship. It is in this realm that much of the panel indicated a desire for professional sanctions. They also opposed interference in the professional management of their organizations, but this problem will remain difficult to control as long as the general structure fails to allocate power and authority clearly.

Interference by boards of trustees in the role of the library executive is a fairly common problem in library management. Roles of the administrator and the board are not clearly defined: the distinction between policy and procedure is difficult to make. Administrators often choose to ignore boards' suggestions or rules that interfere with professional administrative matters. They may also successfully acquire some leverage with the board by allowing some level of administrative or procedural regulation to be introduced by the board in order to gain advantage with the board on other matters. When boards do interfere, the administrator is actually rather powerless to contest the board; he may resign, he may protest with success, he may submit and compromise his professional judgment. The decision depends largely on his own perception of the situation, for he has little guidance or support from the profession. Further, although there would be many opportunities for employment if he were to resign -- the demand for administrators far exceeds the supply -- the head librarian's appointment is largely controlled by laymen, not the profession. Consequently, resigning may invite a "bad risk" label that the profession is generally unable to mitigate, leaving the administrator without professional protection in this regard.

As the importance of the library grows, and the size of funds and clientele increases, the "visibility" of the library and attention also increases. Consequently there comes about a greater degree of conflict over power between the administrator and his board. In

practice it seems that boards are becoming less powerful and turn to the administrator for guidance; those communities with the more "backward" libraries have the stronger boards and more often compromise professional standards.

The budget is the most "sensitive" area of conflict, but the librarian does most of the work on the budget in consultation with one or two board members and city officials. Although the board is supposed to participate in preparation and planning, most librarians have more initiative than their boards, and if they have strong governmental support for their budgets, the boards are virtually rubber stamps. As a matter of fact, many librarians feel that the board should participate more fully in library affairs including the preparation of the budget.

Other characteristics of local government have potential for conflict. The terms of aldermen last for only two years, and the rate of turnover makes it difficult for administrators to develop useful relationships with them. The aldermen are largely ignorant of the library and use it little. Some see the library only as a source of pressure, as the community forces them to take action concerning it, or as an asset in attracting new industry. Often their petty jealousies over political jurisdictions interfere with the administrator's desires for participation in regional and other cooperative programs. Furthermore, the library must compete with other agencies for special fund drives -- bonds, tax supplements -- and its rank in such competition with schools, roads, and hospitals is evidently low.

On the whole, appointed government officials are closer to the library than the elected officials, and they use it more for personal materials and for special, technical information in their work. They also seem to have a greater general interest in the library as a community service. On the other hand, library executives feel that their boards are more understanding than the government, although they do not feel that their boards are active enough or effective enough. Indeed they are ambivalent. They turn to officials for support; often get it in spite of board apathy and feel that the boards are nonetheless more "understanding". Boards have more continuous relationships with the librarians and are legally bound to them; such ties are strong apparently. Further, boards do deal quite often with policy problems on a broader level while government deals more often with such immediate "maintenance" problems as supply of materials and services. It is clear from the interviews, however, that "politicking" pays off for library executives

and an active minority in the profession would like to have boards of trustees abolished and take their chances with public officials.

To strengthen their positions in the community, library administrators resort to several tactics, some of which they all approve whereas others are more doubtful. Special services to groups bring favor from the community to the librarian, especially those to government and business -- and perhaps, increasingly, those to various "disadvantaged" groups. Namely, while the manifest consequence of such changes is to provide more service, the latent consequences are to increase favor for the library generally. This is clearly understood by many administrators although usually the only deliberately exploited service is that given to business and government. Library administrators claim to feel quite free to air library problems, although they remain uncomfortable at the prospect of public controversy. In the face of crises, most administrators can make use of two tactics -- they take advantage of opportunities to be heard publicly in defense of the library and they seek out powerful individuals and groups in the community without exposure to public scrutiny. Many librarians are uncomfortable in attempting to influence the appointments of board members, a tactic sometimes adopted in an effort to strengthen library programs. Despite their uneasiness many often use this power. Even aggressive librarians are reluctant to use the library itself as a weapon by reducing services in order to get more support. This is felt to be "dangerous" tactics likely to alienate the community, a device appropriate only in emergencies.

Generally speaking, while the profession is held to be more important than local expectations as a source for the definition of library goals, loyalty to the profession ranks second in importance to loyalty to the community. This can be summed up by saying that while policies of the public libraries fall increasingly in line with national professional goals, the means of implementing them, their timing, and compromises with them are determined by local sentiment.

The public's attitude toward the library is mixed -- it is seen as a recreational and an educational organization with growing emphasis on the educational dimension. Despite increasing patronage by students, minority groups, and the lower-classes, the public library remains and is expected to remain a middle-class institution. The patterns of programs and use for this group have not formed distinctly. That is, the demand for materials by patrons is still more important than the special

programs or services planned by the librarian. In this sense, the presumably dynamic and aggressive nature of the library is subordinated to public definition of library service. This does not mean, however, that the library is condemned to a strictly passive role. The successful libraries are those in which librarians have selected materials judiciously from the great variety available in anticipation of demand and then who have created a congenial atmosphere and general awareness of the library's services. The "failure" of the library as a dynamic, aggressive organization is due either to (1) the lack of adequate funds and staff to provide special services to bring more patronage or (2) to the undeveloped acceptance of the library's role in education-information as a highly structured and active agency. The members of the library public apparently feel more comfortable in dealing with the library on an individual basis with the initiation of reading activity coming from the reader, not from the library, and with service generally provided on an individual rather than a group basis.

The size of the largely middle-class library clientele is small and has somewhat unsophisticated ideas of library service, but it is vocal and disproportionately powerful in the community. It is able to insure a minimal level of service and provides a basis for growth by use of the library and by agitation for governmental support. Such political support remains invariably non-partisan and is relatively unorganized. Particular groups organize in order to elicit votes for library bonds or special taxes and disband when the objectives are reached. The exceptions to this are the trustees and those libraries who have Friends of the Library groups on a permanent basis. Other civic groups provide a kind of backstop of library support, but they include the library along with many other activities. Accordingly, their interest must be reactivated as any special need arises. Direct opposition to the library is rare; apathy is the major enemy. However, among the most influential patrons is the professional, technical, and managerial class, a group of growing importance in American society. Considerable strengthening of the public library support comes from this articulate part of the middle-class and it is held that the future of the public library will be considerably brighter due to increased appreciation of library services by this segment of society.

Library administrators say that they are generally satisfied with their role. While the frustrations are many, they are not as important as the satisfaction derived from their work. There are, however, two major sources

of dissatisfaction. While relatively well-paid in comparison with other officials, administrators do not feel that they are accorded the esteem that their work and ability deserve. Further, as we have indicated, a general lack of support and interest from trustees, the government, and much of the community at large is a source of great discouragement.

Library executives learn to play their roles through education, pre-administration experience and observation, and as administrators. The latter is most important because the norms presented in professional education are vague, the work and relationships of the administrator are not generally visible and have not been clearly presented to him as a student or a worker, and because there are many variations from one community to another in legal, social, financial, and other obligations. The interpersonal tasks are more important than the technical ones, and most of the important social relationships are with lay persons outside the library staff. The lack of training for administration -- for both its social and technical tasks -- is a handicap in developing the kind of administrative strength that is desired. A further handicap arises because of administrators' uncertainty regarding sanctions or specific operational guides for administration, and most administrators feel that there should be some.

Library administration is a public profession, with a contractual agreement between trustees, local government, and the library executive himself. This makes for a bureaucratic orientation on the part of the administrator, who is also a member of an independent and "private" profession whose patrons are in the main private persons. This marginal nature of library administration -- being both a bureaucratic and a "private" profession -- constitutes another dimension of "status dilemma". One enjoys high status in his profession because he is an administrator, yet his position in the bureaucracy of government is relatively low. He is supposed to be a leader, but often he can lead only his own staff. He must adopt a neutral stance in the community on many library-oriented issues and consequently in his relations with his trustees and the government as well. Actually, the library administrator has both a "passive" or "neutral" and an "aggressive" set of norms from the library profession to rationalize his decisions. The central problems arise in relating to trustees and government as neutral or active.

The administrator is uncertain about developing or using power. He might circumvent the trustees and appeal directly to the government or to the community

groups which might support him, but then he may invite trustee hostility or find that the community groups are poorly organized or apathetic. The sex of the library administrator may be of crucial importance in any power strategy. Librarianship is predominantly a female occupation dominated by men in positions as administrative librarians, trustees and in government. The male administrator has closer informal relationships with other officials than do women, but he is still clearly differentiated from them by his professional affiliation which is essentially "feminine" in nature. He may have rather weak ties, then, with both his female subordinates and with male superordinates. Female administrators may have stronger ties with the female staff, however, and find themselves not as welcome with male superordinates as are their male counterparts. They consequently turn more to managerial tasks and internal relationships in their organization.

Because library administration is a profession in which other persons are the most direct beneficiaries, and whose material rewards in terms of income, prestige, and approval of others are comparatively low, the motivation of administrators must be in terms of service, achievement, and collectivity (professional) obligation. Yet, notwithstanding the many advances desired, most administrators are satisfied with their work and confident about the future of the profession.

Conclusion

On the basis of our findings and summary several salient conclusions may be drawn. They are in many ways tentative, as the variables are subject to change as our knowledge of the topic is advanced.

The range of permissible behavior for library administrators is quite considerable. This is due in large part to the lack of strong professional negative sanctions and to the pre-eminence of local sanctions which vary widely in their permissiveness. The profession is only modestly self-regulating and the administrator functions quite independently of his profession. He has, of course, internalized many of the norms of the profession and is subject to peer surveillance. Both of these factors, however, are loosely and informally structured, and many of these relationships are vague and lacking in normative definition.

Indeed, the norms attributed to the profession are characteristic of many groups and do not distinguish librarians or library administrators with any great

exactness. Consequently, the library administrator may be described as striving to achieve identity and power through bargaining with officials and others and reliance on general norms and attitudes characteristic of government and business, and education.

The scope of the administrator's expertise is broader than that of his position and role. He has a superior general education, relative to other members of his community, and he is capable of serving both as a general educator in many areas of community life to which he has little access and as an information specialist for the many particular social and occupational groups in his community.

The sex of the library executive has played an important part in nearly all aspects of his role. In general, this means that female administrators are handicapped far more than men in initiating and maintaining fruitful relationships with the predominantly male government structure of which the library is a part. As more men enter the profession and follow the expected path of rapid promotion to executive positions, both the position of the library in the community and the role of the library executive may be made easier, as it becomes more widely accepted in society that the profession, in its executive posts, at least, is more male than female. At the same time, some greater progress may be expected toward the acceptance of women as professionals, experts, and executives in public life. Women library executives may then enjoy more equitable status and power in governing their organizations.

The library administrator cannot be as creative an executive in all the respects and to the degree that the literature implies. He is, however, extremely capable of initiating programs and policies in the community and in initiating relationships that will facilitate their instrumentation, chiefly through budgetary improvements. He undergoes a great deal of stress in such cases, and he must struggle with little guidance or support from his profession. He is moving into the political arena with some trepidation, as well he might, in questioning the status quo of library government.

The limited and unclear "sphere of autonomy" and the rather wide range of behavior permissible for library executives constitute two major problems for the profession, the organization, and the administrator who would be successfully creative in his role. Both problems will come nearer solution as the library increases in importance and as a new generation of presumably more

aggressive librarians emerges and asserts its authority. In both instances, power plays a crucial function: power accrues to the library as its technical resources and services improve and the demand for them grows, and as the librarian emerges as the primary authority for control of the organization due to his expertise and his ability to take advantage of the acquisition of power. Where the administrator fails in this latter effort the power will pass to other organizations.

This is becoming dramatically clearer with the development of relevant technological advances in the production, processing, and retrieval of information. If the library and the librarian are clearly associated with this new technology their power and influence promises to thrive. If they fail to exploit the technological advances, other organizations will fill their roles and acquire the power and influence allied with them. In any such dynamic situations the organization membership, especially its administrators, is confronted with the need to develop their own standards for exploiting the changes in technology and services of the organization.

Important changes lie in the area of social relationships. The social dimension of the library executive's role is presently more important than the performance of his technical tasks, while the extended social relationships that can be expected as an outgrowth of new technology will assuredly increase the interpersonal dimension of his role.

It is incumbent on the profession through its educational preparation and its associations to develop useful norms for the administrator and his staff in order to avoid the excesses of stress that play an undue part in the executive role and to simultaneously enhance the implementation of the organization's goals.

Until such norms are profession-wide, the individual administrator will be left largely to his own devices. His ingenuity in conceiving and enacting appropriate roles and norms provide a partial solution for his own problems, for better or for worse, and at the same time function as a basis for communicating with colleagues in the development of standards for the entire profession. The fundamental problems of public librarianship are highlighted in libraries whose executives are most creative. Analysis of these problems and of the workable norms and procedures developed by the more imaginative and socially skillful executives serve to increase our understanding of the professional employed in a bureaucracy, of interbureaucratic relationships, and of leadership. All are factors of paramount importance in generating superior public library administrators.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Background and Career

1. Age range ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59
 ☐ over 60
2. ☐ Male ☐ Female
3. Marital status ☐ Single ☐ Married
 ☐ Separated
4. Education: Degrees and Institutions
5. How many years have you been in this position?
6. Have you been a chief librarian in any other library?
7. If so, where?
8. Are you a native of this community?
9. Do you feel that this helps or hinders your administrative duties?
10. If you had it to do over again, would you choose a different job? Was librarianship your first choice as a career?
11. What are the basic sources of dissatisfaction in your job:
 ☐ the demands of the job
 ☐ yourself
 ☐ the authorities over you
 ☐ the community
 ☐ the profession
 ☐ other (indicate)
12. What are the major satisfactions in your job?
13. Do you expect to remain an administrator or to turn to some other kind of position?

Attitude toward his Position and Work

14. What of your activities are most important?
15. What of your activities are most time-consuming?
16. How do you think you rank in prestige with other administrators in the community?
17. What organization in this community is most like the library? Least like the library?
18. What would you tell a person who was trying to decide whether to take an administrative position?
19. What makes a "good" library administrator?
20. What kinds of things do library administrators do that you consider incompetent or unprofessional? What should be done to them?
21. What the public thinks about librarians can be important. What negative traits do you find locally attributed to librarians? What positive traits?

22. Do you find that the public image of the librarian interferes with your administration of the library?
23. How do you think that the predominance of women in librarianship affects the administration of the library? Is it easier to get salary increases for men than women?
Is authority in book selection more acceptable if carried on by a man rather than by a woman?
Can women "wheel and deal" as readily as men? Does it make a difference in public library administration?
Do men tend to censor books more than women?

Relations with the Community

24. What sort of contact do you have with patrons? Problematic? Frequent? Frustratingly "distant"?
Do you get any pressure from patrons through the board or local government?
25. What kind of people use your library?
Do you think that lower-class patronage may become dominant?
26. What activities in your work does the public approve most? Approve least? Understand least?
27. Does the public see the library primarily as an educational agency?
28. Who are the library's friends, if any?
Who are the library's opponents?
29. Other than trustees and government officials, what individuals or groups in your community have a voice in setting policy for procedure for the library? Labor unions?, tax payer associations?, P.T.A.'s?
30. What do you think would happen if the library closed?
31. When you run into problems with officials or with the board do you feel free to talk and write about it locally?
32. Do you write in professional journals about such problems?
33. Would anyone locally be likely to know about this if you did?
34. Do you think that a librarian in your position should speak out when he feels that certain policies are not just?
35. Are you encouraged or permitted to actively seek support for funds by addressing local groups such as service clubs, union locals, etc.?
36. What community activities are you expected to join?
37. Are you called on to participate in planning for education in the community?

Relations with the Profession

38. How would you rank these items in their importance to you as an administrator?
Professional meetings _____ State _____ Regional

- ☐ National
☐ Professional journals ☐ State
☐ Regional ☐ National
☐ Professional subordinate staff
☐ Librarians you know in similar positions
☐ None of these are very helpful
39. What is the most important help you get from the profession in your job?
40. Do you have any regular communication with other librarians about problems in your job?
41. Do you feel a stronger attachment to librarianship in general or to public librarianship or to any other division of the profession?

Differing Professional and Local Expectations

42. Do you feel stronger loyalties to the profession or to your local community?
Are these groups essentially in conflict with each other?
43. How do you feel about affiliating with other libraries or library systems?
44. How do the local officials feel about this?
45. Are you also engaged in consulting, research, teaching or similar activities?
46. Do you think that these activities interfere with or aid you in your job?
47. Do local officials expect you to engage in such professional activities?
48. Do you think that librarians should be active professionally in working on community problems or in research with other professional people?
49. What are the major functions of the trustee in your library?
Do they pass on acquisitions? On the employment of staff? On discharge of staff?
50. Do you have any voice in nominating or selecting members of your board?
51. Do you have difficulty in defining the jurisdiction of the library?
For instance, do the trustees and government officials accept the professional staff as authorities on library matters?
52. Does your board or the local government expect you to do things you consider unprofessional?
53. Do they leave it up to you to determine what the public wants or do they have their own views on that?
54. In many communities working-class people use the library rarely. Does your board encourage the use of the library by these people?
55. Do local officials and trustees use the library very much? For what purposes?
56. Are the local government officials more impressed with statistics on circulation and reference or with building up your collection and extending services?

57. When you expect to have a problem in getting a budget accepted do you try to get some support from some of the members of the board or other officials before presenting the budget formally?
What do you do when salary raises, for instance, are contested by some members? Leave it up to the board without getting much involved? Act as mediator to get a compromise? What are your arguments?
58. Can you get what you want or need by going through channels -- or do you try various "angles"?
59. Do you have to compete with local schools for money and materials?
60. There has been a great deal said about giving library service to groups as well as to individuals. How do you feel about this? What kinds of groups do you serve?
61. Do you provide special services to any local business or industrial firms? If so, do you get extra fees for this? Do you prepare confidential reports for these firms? How do you think that this service affects the library?
62. Do you or any of your staff participate in any research or educational projects with other professional people who are not librarians?
63. Do you think that librarians should have social friends among city officials? Among other professional people in the community?
64. A few years ago the Brooklyn Public Library was having serious budget problems. It reduced its public service drastically, demonstrating what must happen if it didn't receive more financial support. Community reaction was quite strong and the library was given more money.
What do you think about this kind of action on the part of the librarian?
65. Which group is more important in really setting guidelines or standards for your library policies and procedures -- the profession or the local officials?
66. Who in the community seems to understand your problems best? Trustees or government officials?
67. Can boards be effective in representing the library? Are they?
68. What are the most pressing problems of librarians in the medium-sized public library?
69. How well do you feel that you contend with these problems -- in the United States and in North Carolina?
70. Let us suppose that your library were not providing racially integrated service and you spoke out either for or against this policy -- what do you think would happen to you?

71. In sum, how do you feel about being motivated to be active and aggressive anticipating and planning for library needs and yet supposedly closely governed by your board?